



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

- This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.
- A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.
- This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.
- The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.
- When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

Xenophon's Theory of Moral Education

Houliang Lu

PhD in Classics

University of Edinburgh

2014

The candidate hereby confirms that this thesis was composed by him and represents his own work, except where credit has been given to the work of others. He furthermore confirms that no part of this thesis has been submitted for any other degree or qualification except as specified on the title page.

HOULIANG LU

Houliang Lu

Acknowledgement

This thesis cannot be completed without the help of many people. First of all, I express my profound gratitude to my supervisors, Prof. Douglas Cairns and Prof. Andrew Erskine, for their careful correction and valuable advice for my thesis. I should also thank my former supervisor, Prof. Xiaoling Guo in Beijing Normal University as well as Prof. Shaoxiang Yan in Capital Normal University of Beijing, whose support and recommendation enable me to do my PhD program in University of Edinburgh. Besides, I am very grateful to the Chinese Scholarships Council and the University of Edinburgh, whose funding covers my tuition fee as well as my living expenses, so that I can finish my PhD programme in Edinburgh much more easily.

Special thanks must also be given to Mr. Christopher Strachan, Dr. Lisa Hau, Dr. Sandra Bingham, Mr. John Houston as well as editors of *Journal of Cambridge Studies*. Mr. Strachan gave me a lot of guidance and encouragement to help me improve my ancient Greek. Dr. Hau kindly sent me her PhD thesis on ancient Greek historiography for reference. Dr. Sandra Bingham took part in the first and second annual reviews of my dissertation and provided lots of valuable advice for me. Mr. Houston proofread all my chapters and carefully corrected some English grammar mistakes in this work. And the editors of *Journal of Cambridge Studies* offered me a chance to publish an article based on Part 3, Chapter 2 of this thesis and provided some good advice for its later revision.

I dedicate this thesis to my parents and my wife.

Abstract

Xenophon the Athenian, who is well known as a historian and a witness of Socratic philosophy but is usually excluded from the list of classical writers on education, actually developed his own systematic thought on moral education from a social and mainly political perspective in his extant works. His discourse on moral education presents for us the view of an unusual historical figure, an innovative thinker as well as a man of action, a mercenary general and a world citizen in his age; and is therefore different from that of contemporary pure philosophers, such as Plato and Aristotle. Furthermore, as a prolific author respected in both the classical world and the early modern era, Xenophon's doctrine on moral education greatly influences the later development of European cultural history.

This thesis explores the background and content of Xenophon's thought on moral education, as well as its application in his other literary works, which are not directly on the same topic but are indirectly influenced by it. Part 1 discusses the background which produces Xenophon's thought on moral education. As a historian of his own age, Xenophon's negative view of the world he lived in is fully expressed in his *Hellenica*; and his idea of social education organised by a competent political leader serves as a proposal to transform the disordered Greek world in his time. As a follower of Socrates, Xenophon adopts his teacher's approach of focusing on the study of moral issues and leadership; and the need to make apology for Socrates helps to shape many heroes in Xenophon's works into extremely pious men and beneficial moral teachers. Part 2 analyses the content of Xenophon's thought on moral education. This idea is systematically explained in his *Cyropaedia* and advocated in a rhetorical and persuasive manner in his *Hiero*. By modern ethical standards, Xenophon's moral education is supported by dark art of government and cannot always be justified; but this dark side is tolerable in Xenophon's view as long as it ultimately serves for good purpose. In his *Poroi* and *Oeconomicus*, Xenophon

makes a further development of his thought by confirming that the art of accumulating and using wealth is also an indispensable skill for organisers of social education. Part 3 presents the application of Xenophon's theory of moral education in his epoch-making literary composition. His *Agésilas*, which serves as a prototype for later biographies, depicts a historical figure living and acting according to the ethical principles which Xenophon sets for ideal political leaders; while his *Oeconomicus*, which influenced Hellenistic and Roman agricultural works greatly, attempts to bring the experience of public education into the domestic sphere.

The analysis of these themes confirms that Xenophon actually established a theory of moral education, which is social, highly political but also philosophical, in his extant corpus. On the one hand, Xenophon's theory is less profound than that of Plato or Aristotle and is sometimes superficial and occasionally self-contradictory; on the other hand, the theory is original, innovative and influential in the history of classical literature, and therefore deserves our respect and serious treatment.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----|
| Declaration of Own Work | i |
| Acknowledgement | ii |
| Abstract | iii |
| Table of Contents | v |
| Editions | vi |
| Introduction | 1 |
| Part 1: Background of Xenophon's Thought on Moral Education | 13 |
| Chapter 1: Xenophon's View of His Time | 14 |
| Chapter 2: Influence of Socrates on Xenophon's Thought on Moral Education | 46 |
| Part 2: A Systematic Theory of Moral Education from a Social Perspective | 68 |
| Chapter 1: Nature and Origin of Xenophon's <i>Cyropaedia</i> | 69 |
| Chapter 2: Xenophon's <i>Hiero</i> : A Rhetorical Dialogue to Persuade the Organiser of Social Education | 108 |
| Chapter 3: Dark Side of Xenophon's Social Education | 139 |
| Chapter 4: A Supplement to Political Education of Social Morality: The Primitive Model of Moral Economics Established in Xenophon's <i>Oeconomicus</i> and <i>Poroi</i> | 173 |
| Part 3: Application of Xenophon's Theory of Social Education in His Literary Composition | 197 |
| Chapter 1: Xenophon's <i>Agesilaus</i> and the Moral Tradition of Ancient Biography | 199 |
| Chapter 2: Queen Bee and Housewife: Extension of Social Education into the Private Sphere in Xenophon's <i>Oeconomicus</i> | 229 |
| Conclusion | 250 |
| Bibliography | 256 |

Editions

As one of the most important and popular writers in classical age, Xenophon's most works are available in almost all the four major modern series of classical texts.

BT (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Latinorum Teubneriana) offers Xenophon's works edited by Gemoll, Hude and other scholars in around 1910. The older edition of BT prepared by German scholar G. Sauppe is the basis of almost all later academic editions of ancient Greek texts of Xenophon, and is still adopted by Loeb Classical Library. The major drawback of the latest Teubner edition is that it is compiled by many hands and many volumes of it are already out of print and not always easily available in libraries.

The Budé edition offers original texts of a few works of Xenophon, including the *Anabasis*, *Oeconomicus* and *Memorabilia*, usually with quite accurate and highly praised French translation, brief critical apparatus and full notes. The edition is still incomplete. Generally speaking it is conservative and does not make much crucial correction of former standard Greek texts.

Up to now, the standard edition of Xenophon's complete works is still that of Oxford Classical Texts, prepared by E.C. Marchant from 1900 to 1920. This edition is complete with brief critical apparatus, and is widely accepted and used for academic studies.

For the English translation, one of the most popular editions is that of Loeb Classical Library, translated by C.L. Brownson, E.C. Marchant and other scholars in early twentieth century. Most of these books adopt the old edition of Greek text prepared by G. Sauppe, which is in need of correction itself. The translation is not always accurate and is occasionally quite old in language style. For example, Sarah Pomeroy points out that E.C. Marchant translates γύναι as 'my dear' instead of the more proper address 'wife' in the translation of *Oeconomicus* according to the common usage in English at his time, which lends the original word affective quality

it does not have at all and may prevent us from finding out some information for gender studies in ancient texts. In 1989, Loeb Classical Library published a revised edition of Xenophon's works. They are not thoroughly reworked but offer some useful correction on certain texts of translation and notes made by John Dillery and G.W. Bowersock.

Apart from the four major series above, certain separate editions and commentaries on Xenophon's individual works are more up-dated and therefore noteworthy, including Pomeroy's *Xenophon, Oeconomicus, A Social and Historical Commentary* (1994), with a new English translation from E.C. Marchant's OCT text; A.J. Bowen's *Xenophon, Symposium, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (1998); and Michael Lipka's *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution, Introduction, Text, Commentary* (2002) with both new Greek text produced by study of manuscripts and a new English translation.

For the purpose of my dissertation, I use E.C. Marchant's OCT texts and the English translation of LCL (with slight correction when it is necessary) for citation as a general rule. For certain individual works with new text or translation, the most recent edition is preferred if it is academic and widely accepted.

Texts and Translations of Xenophon's Works Used in this Thesis:

Xenophon, *Opera Omnia*, Marchant, E., ed., Oxford Classical Texts, Oxford & New York, Oxford University Press

— Tomus I, *Historia Graeca*, 2008 (reprinted).

— Tomus II, *Commentarii, Oeconomicus, Conuiuium, Apologia Socratis*, second edition, 1921.

— Tomus III, *Expeditio Cyri*, second edition, 2008 (reprinted).

— Tomus IV, *Institutio Cyri*, 1910.

— Tomus V, *Opuscula*, 2005 (reprinted).

Xenophon, *Works*, Loeb Classical Library, London & Cambridge, Massachusetts,

Harvard University Press

- Vol. I, *Hellenica*, Books 1-4, Brownson, C., tr., 1989.
- Vol. II, *Hellenica*, Books 5-7, Brownson, C., tr., 1989.
- Vol. III, *Anabasis*, Brownson, C., tr., Dillery, J., rev., 1989.
- Vol. IV, *Memorabilia*, *Oeconomicus*, *Symposium*, *Apology*, Marchant, E. and Todd, O., trs., 1989.
- Vol. V, *Cyropaedia*, Books 1-4, Miller, W., tr., 1989.
- Vol. VI, *Cyropaedia*, Books 5-8, Miller, W., tr., 1989.
- Vol. VII, *Scripta Minora*, Marchant, E., tr., Bowersock, G., rev., 1989.

Xenophon, *Symposium, with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*, Bowen, A., ed./tr. /comm., Warminster, 1998.

Xenophon, *Spartan Constitution, Introduction, Text, Commentary*, Lipka, M., ed./tr. /comm., Berlin & New York, 2002.

Xenophon, *Oeconomicus, A Social and Historical Commentary*, Pomeroy, S., ed./tr./comm., Oxford, 1994.

Citation of other classical writers is generally taken from the texts of the most standard editions available, and the translations in LCL with some necessary correction. As the English translations of Plato edited by John M. Cooper (1999, Indianapolis/Cambridge) and of Aristotle edited by Jonathan Barnes (in two volumes, 1984, Princeton) are of high quality and influential, I choose them instead of the Loeb translations for citation. All abbreviations for ancient authors and texts adopted in this thesis generally follow the examples listed in *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Hornblower, S., Spawforth, A. and Eidinow, E., eds., fourth edition, Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

Full bibliographical detail of modern papers and monographs is provided in the bibliography.

Introduction

As a prolific writer of the fourth century B.C., Xenophon offers modern scholars valuable clues for the study of ancient Greek history, philosophy and literature. His *Hellenica* and *Anabasis* provide basic materials for us to reconstruct historical events taking place in Xenophon's lifetime; his Socratic writings are the most important documents on Socrates' life and thought besides the works of Plato and Aristotle; and his *Agésilas*, *Oeconomicus* and *Cynegeticus* are taken as examples and prototypes of later literary genres of biography, agricultural writing and practical manual. Nevertheless, in modern scholarship since the nineteenth century, Xenophon has seldom received serious treatment in his own right, and his thought has generally been considered to be unoriginal and unsystematic. This attitude is also reflected in modern scholars' ignorance or negative evaluation of Xenophon's role in the history of thought on education.

In 1948, Henri-Irénée Marrou published his *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*. In this classic monograph on the great educators of the ancient western world, Xenophon's name is not even in the list. In Marrou's eyes, Xenophon's works have little to do with education, and they only deserve to be cited occasionally for the study of other great figures in this area, for example Homer,¹ Lycurgus,² Socrates³ and certain sophists.⁴ The only works in his corpus relevant to education are his three technical manuals.⁵ But they can only prove that Xenophon advocated a type of physical training for traditional aristocrats, which had become conservative and out-of-date in his time. In short, Marrou believes that Xenophon is at most a marginal and minimal figure in the history of Greek thought on education; and his idea of physical training, if it can be taken as a type of educational thought at all, is

¹ Marrou (1948), 35.

² Marrou (1948), 41, 46.

³ Marrou (1948), 60.

⁴ Marrou (1948), 90.

⁵ Marrou (1948), 71.

unoriginal and conservative, and therefore contains very little value in itself.

In the *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.* published in 1964, Frederick A.G. Beck partly amends Marrou's neglect of Xenophon's contribution in Greek thought on education, and incorporates a brief section (roughly 8 pages) to discuss Xenophon's own ideas. The title chosen for this section, 'Education as Social Habituation',⁶ shows that Beck already notices that the type of education Xenophon advocates is not confined to school education. He also vaguely realises that Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and some other works contain an intention to educate through great examples.⁷ Nevertheless, the whole section is full of harsh critique of Xenophon as a disappointing author on education.⁸ In Beck's opinion, the *Cyropaedia* discusses only the education of princes⁹ and represents a superficial understanding, which takes education as 'the acquisition of certain basic skills necessary for the defence of the homeland, as well as the development of socially correct habits in and through typical social situations'.¹⁰ He complains that in Xenophon's scheme 'there is no hint of what is actually regarded as cultural education — no reading, no writing, no study of literature or mathematics'. Therefore, Beck's attitude towards Xenophon is in essence not greatly different from Marrou's. Although Beck admits that Xenophon's contribution to educational theory is not confined to his three manuals on physical training only, he still believes that what Xenophon discusses beyond that topic contains very little value and is superficial; and Xenophon's neglect of cultural education is incompatible with the common concept of education in the twentieth century A.D. (which focuses on teaching young children to read and write as well as introducing cultural knowledge of humanities and natural science to youths in a high school or university) and is therefore a foolish and inexcusable fault.

However, a contemporary German classist, Werner Jaeger, depicts a very

⁶ Beck (1964), 244.

⁷ Beck (1964), 249.

⁸ Beck (1964), 244, 252.

⁹ Beck (1964), 249.

¹⁰ Beck (1964), 249.

different image of Xenophon as a valuable writer on education in his *Paideia; die Formung des griechischen Menschen*, published in 1933-1947. In his view, ‘all Xenophon’s books are more or less dominated by the desire to educate’,¹¹ and his *Cyropaedia* and *Spartan Constitution* are very important works on education. Jaeger points out that if we take the term ‘education’ in its strict sense, we would assert that only the first few chapters in those two works are relevant to it.¹² But Xenophon actually understands the term in a much broader sense, which also covers the content of remaining parts of the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution*, namely the supervision of adult life.¹³ Although Jaeger’s account of Xenophon is also short and basically narrative, he points out that Xenophon as an educator and theorist on education is much more important in Greek history than what Marrou and Beck supposed him to be.

In my opinion, the difference between the two views of Xenophon’s status is determined by different approaches adopted by the three scholars. For Marrou and Beck, the standard by which to judge the value of ancient authors is the established system of modern education; and their aim is to explain how ancient doctrines contribute to build up our understanding of cultural education and justify modern educational practice. For Frederick Beck, his choice of the period 450-350 B.C. as the object of his research is due to his view that it is ‘perhaps the most important period in the whole history of education’¹⁴ and still has great impact on the age we live in. In that sense, Xenophon’s discussion of the elevation of human virtue and the maintenance of social customs should be neglected as a heterodoxy, because it has little to do with intellectual education carried out in modern schools and universities, which is supposed to be shaped by other influential thinkers living in this key period, for example sophists, Socrates and Plato, but not by Xenophon. On the other hand, though as Clara Park and E. Harrison have already pointed out, Jaeger’s work also

¹¹ Jaeger (1945), 159.

¹² Jaeger (1945), 167.

¹³ Jaeger (1945), 167.

¹⁴ Beck (1964), 7.

has serious shortcomings and ceased to be influential after his lifetime: his general view of classical culture is profoundly influenced by biased ideology, as he exaggerates the greatness of the past;¹⁵ and his original German text is obscure and sometimes difficult to understand.¹⁶ Nevertheless, following the strict discipline of German philology, his study of Greek education starts from discussion on ancient Greeks' understanding of παιδεία and ἀρετή, which shows that he attempts to understand education in ancient Greek cultural context from the very beginning of his research. As Clara Park comments, Jaeger 'did not simplify the past, nor did he sentimentalize it. He insisted, as only a true historian can, that we see it in its own terms and not ours, and cautioned against the easy game of drawing contemporary parallels'.¹⁷ In the passage on Xenophon's role in Greek education, he also pays enough attention to the social background which produced Xenophon's ideas.¹⁸ Therefore, he can clearly see that what Xenophon talks about is παιδεία in his mind as well as in contemporary cultural context, and would not totally neglect these valuable materials due to modern bias. In my opinion, Werner Jaeger's approach in this aspect is relatively more historical and more reliable, and his principle should be adopted as a fundamental starting point for new research on Xenophon's contribution on ancient Greek education.

From 1989 to 1993, three noteworthy English-language monographs on Xenophon's most important work on παιδεία, the *Cyropaedia*, were published in succession, including James Tatum's *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus* (1989), Bodil Due's *The Cyropaedia, Xenophon's Aims and Methods* (1989) and Deborah Levine Gera's *Xenophon's Cyropaedia, Style, Genre and Literary Technique* (1993). Tatum first argues that the *Cyropaedia* is not a marginal work in Xenophon's corpus, as most former scholars believed, because 'no other work he

¹⁵ Park (1983), 379.

¹⁶ Harrison (1940), 32-33.

¹⁷ Park (1983), 379.

¹⁸ Jaeger (1945), 159.

[Xenophon] wrote is so compendious, none is so evocative of his other writings'.¹⁹ He also realises that Xenophon's doctrine in this work contains an element of religious education,²⁰ and it is closely related to Xenophon's other writings, such as his *Oeconomicus*, *Anabasis*, *Spartan Constitution*, *Memorabilia* and perhaps also *Hellenica*.²¹ Generally speaking, Tatum takes the *Cyropaedia* as Xenophon's blueprint of a fictional and utopian political model, in which moral and religious education of Socratic style plays a crucial role. Bodil Due adopts an approach similar to that of Werner Jaeger and recognises that Xenophon uses παιδεία in its wider sense,²² so that the *Cyropaedia* on the whole is precisely a work on the 'upbringing and education of Cyrus the Elder'.²³ The aim of Xenophon's composition of the *Cyropaedia* is to make his readers 'learn from the example of Cyrus what it takes to become a good ruler', so that the disastrous and immoral scene he depicts in the opening passage should be avoided.²⁴ Deborah Gera studies the image of Cyrus the Great and suggests that it is partly based on the prototype of Socrates.²⁵ She points out that there are three kinds of Socratic influences shown in the *Cyropaedia*: 'personal traits shared by Socrates and Cyrus, issues and events related to Socrates' trial and final days which are incorporated into the work, and didactic, dialectical conversations'.²⁶

In my opinion, the almost simultaneous birth of these three books on the same work of Xenophon shows both sides of the coin. First of all, it demonstrates that our view of Xenophon before 1989 is generally unsatisfactory and sometimes quite confusing; because even down to that age, scholars still shared little consensus on the very nature of the *Cyropaedia*, one of Xenophon's longest and most important works. James Tatum believes that it presents an ideal political regime; Bodil Due argues that

¹⁹ Tatum (1989), 40.

²⁰ Tatum (1989), 31.

²¹ Tatum (1989), 58.

²² Due (1989), 15.

²³ Due (1989), 14.

²⁴ Due (1989), 17.

²⁵ Gera (1993), 26-131.

²⁶ Gera (1993), 27.

its aim is educational; and Gera obviously takes it as a fictional literary work. And all these three authors still have to make apology for Xenophon in their opening passages in order to justify that the *Cyropaedia* does deserve to be treated seriously as a valuable work in itself. In the second place, the publication of these three works is a landmark for the study of Xenophon as an important writer on education. In my view, their diverse opinions on the nature of the *Cyropaedia* are all partly right. The work is political, educational as well as philosophical. It takes up a central position in all those of Xenophon's extant works that are relevant to moral education and deserves to be studied seriously.

In 2011, Vivienne Gray published her latest monograph, *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes, Reading the Reflections*. In this work, Gray compares all extant writings of Xenophon relevant to leadership, and concludes that 'Xenophon has a universal definition of the leader's functions whenever they occur'.²⁷ She summarises former scholarship on Xenophon's presentation of leadership, especially those works on Xenophon's 'negative' depiction of ideal leaders (which Gray labels as 'dark reading').²⁸ Finally, Gray argues that Xenophon is 'a literary artist worth analysing' and 'an innovator in his adaptations of previous literature, in his engagement with the reader in his overt evaluations, in his creation of his own formulaic scenes, in the theory of viewing and the theory of irony and of allegory, in his development of narrative devices such as the epilogue and in his use of irony'.²⁹ She further points out that these literary contributions are closely related to the images of power appearing in a series of his works, among which no passage 'can be read without cross-reference to passages of similar type in his other works'.³⁰

Although Vivienne Gray's research on Xenophon takes a literary perspective and treats leadership rather than education, it has a lot in common with Jaeger's work on παιδεία and ἀρετή, as well as Bodil Due's study of the *Cyropaedia* as a work on

²⁷ Gray (2011), 44.

²⁸ Gray (2011), 54-62.

²⁹ Gray (2011), 372.

³⁰ Gray (2011), 372.

education in wide sense. Therefore, Gray's work also contributes to the study of Xenophon as a writer on education by confirming his originality as an author, showed in his creative adaptation of literary heritage and his consistency as a thinker, showed in the consistent image of the ideal leaders depicted in his various extant works. Her monograph justifies and provides solid foundation for future research on Xenophon's thought on παιδεία.

In sum, from Henri-Irénée Marrou and Werner Jaeger to Bodil Due and Vivienne Gray, the development of scholarship generally shows three features. First of all, in the area of educational thought, the image of Xenophon has been elevated from a marginal and unoriginal writer to a systematic and creative thinker, whose main interest and chief contribution lies in his interpretation of morality and leadership. In the second place, researchers have gradually abandoned the method of imposing modern concepts and requirements of education on the term παιδεία that Xenophon discusses in his works; instead, they attempt to interpret Xenophon's doctrine in his own context by clarifying the meaning of relevant ancient Greek vocabulary (Werner Jaeger), the aim of his composition in its contemporary background (Bodil Due), the source and prototype of his model (Deborah Gera), and his personal understanding of political power (Vivienne Gray). Thirdly, scholars' interest in Xenophon's contribution to Greek educational theory has been diverted from his practical guidance on physical training in his three manuals to his design of moral education carried out by ideal leadership, which is chiefly shown in his *Cyropaedia* but also exists in most of his other writings in a corresponding way. This breakthrough indicates that it is already possible (and necessary) to treat Xenophon as an independent and important contributor to the history of ancient Greek educational thought, and to interpret the systematic theory shown in all of his extant works thoroughly.

The aim of my thesis is to analyse Xenophon's thought on moral education, the key point of παιδεία in Xenophon's extant writings. In Xenophon's eyes, παιδεία

does not only deal with the teaching of writing and calculating, poetry and music, but contains a much broader meaning. It is life-long and social, being similar to the Persian educational system (the *Cyropaedia*); it is philosophical and focuses on the pursuit of ἀρετή and εὐδαιμονία in a philosophical sense for all suitable people³¹ living in the society (the *Hiero* and the *Memorabilia*); it is also political, as it must be carried out by competent leaders (the *Cyropaedia* and the *Agésilas*) under a satisfactory πολιτεία (the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution*); yet it is not confined to the political sphere only and is extended by Xenophon into domestic and economic life (the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi*) and applied for his literary composition in innovative genres (the *Oeconomicus*, the *Agésilas* and the *Cynegeticus*). In sum, it is a core issue which dominates the composition of most of Xenophon's extant writings and deserves to be treated seriously.

By interpreting Xenophon's doctrine on moral education, I shall show that Xenophon is not an unoriginal and uncritical author who copies arbitrarily from Plato, Isocrates and other contemporary or earlier writers, as many students supposed him to be. On the contrary, he managed to create a systematic theory, and consciously presented and developed it in his extant corpus. In the *Cynegeticus*, Xenophon claims that 'my aim in writing has been to produce sound work that will make men not sophistical, but wise and good (καίτοι γέγραπται γε οὕτως, ἵνα ὀρθῶς ἔχη, καὶ μὴ σοφιστικούς ποιῇ ἀλλὰ σοφούς καὶ ἀγαθούς). For I wish my work not to seem useful, but to be so, that it may stand for all time unrefuted.' (Xen. *Cyn.* 13.7; see also Thuc. 1.22.4) Judging from this claim and his critique of sophists in the following passage (Xen. *Cyn.* 13.8-9), I believe that Xenophon, like Plato, Isocrates, Aristotle and many

³¹ In his extant works, Xenophon does not precisely confine the scope of application of his theory of moral education. Nevertheless, it is evident that certain people, who are evil in nature in Xenophon's eyes, cannot be educated for the better. Such examples include undisciplined mercenary soldiers in the *Anabasis*, slaves in the *Cyropaedia* and the *Oeconomicus*, and Critias and Alcibiades, who only deal with Socrates for political purpose. In my opinion, the scope of application for moral education in Xenophon's context might be similar to his understanding of the title καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, which frequently appears in Xenophon's description of ideal moral characters. In contrast to Thuc. Plato and Aristotle, Xenophon seems to be prepared to use this term in a purely moral sense (see Dover (1974), 44) and in a much broader way. In the same way, people with all kinds of backgrounds (Greek/barbarian, male/female, wealthy/poor) who are morally educable, may be educated and even educate others, as Cyrus the Younger, Ischomachus' wife and Socrates in Xenophon's works show to us.

other writers of the fourth century B.C., has a conscious intention to pursue philosophical education in his writings,³² which is even reflected in the *Cynegeticus*, a work on hunting skill that has little to do with ethical education at first glance. The very same principle is also adopted in most of his other writings and remains consistent and recognisable albeit developed to a greater extent, as we can see in later chapters. Xenophon's theory of moral education also contributes to his invention of prototypes of new literary genres on βίος and οἰκονομία, which ensures his lasting influence on the history of literature. Therefore, I believe that the analysis of Xenophon's theory of moral education can be helpful for us to evaluate Xenophon's original contribution to the history of Greek educational thought and his impact on the development of ancient Greek literature.

For this research, the key points of my approach are as follows. First, instead of borrowing modern understandings and principles of education to evaluate Xenophon's ideas and suggestions, I shall try to follow closely his own use of key terms, such as παιδεία, ἀρετή and καλὸς κἀγαθός. Second, in Xenophon's extant corpus, I shall choose his *Cyropaedia* as the core text on moral education, as it is in my opinion Xenophon's masterpiece on that subject which explains his relevant theory most thoroughly and systematically. In the third place, I shall not neglect his other philosophical and historical writings, so as to correct a harmful tradition in scholarship of treating Xenophon's philosophical works and historical ones separately.³³ In my view, the whole corpus of Xenophon is indivisible. His works generally follow the same principle but also show the development of the author's thought and his adaptation of the system in particular situations. What is more, one of the most attractive features of Xenophon is his prolificness and his contribution in many literary forms, including 'Hellenic history, campaign record, biography, encomium, Socratic dialogues, constitutional analysis, encomic treatise and training

³² Pownall (2004), 3.

³³ Hobden and Tuplin (2012), 1-2.

manuals'.³⁴ Therefore, we can only fully recognise Xenophon's value and contribution as a systematic author on moral education by examining his extant corpus as a whole.³⁵

The first part of this thesis discusses the background which produces Xenophon's theory of moral education. Xenophon's thought mainly comes from two sources. The first of them is (in his eyes) the confused, corrupt political situation of the contemporary Greek world. According to his account in the *Hellenica*, the peace and happiness of Greek people were destroyed by their internal strife and the external interference of Persia. Political disorder and the collapse of established social rules caused the corruption of social morality and much brutal, impious behaviour. Among the contemporary powers in Xenophon's world, Athens, Sparta and Persia all declined and failed to provide a successful constitution to unite the disrupted Greek world and re-establish a suitable social morality that would lead people to happiness; powerful and ambitious individual leaders were active in political and military affairs during this time, yet they were also disappointing due to their lack of virtue themselves. Therefore, Xenophon had to turn to ancient ages to find his ideal models of leadership (the reign of Cyrus the Great and Lycurgus) and create an innovative, utopian leadership to carry out his design of moral education.

The second source of Xenophon's thought on moral education comes from Socrates. As a great teacher and hero in Xenophon's mind, Socrates attracted his attention to the study of morality and leadership; the accusation against Socrates and the need to make apology for both Socrates and Xenophon himself as a follower of Socrates helped to shape the images of heroes in Xenophon's other works, who are always extremely pious and beneficial to the people they deal with.

Part Two, the core of my thesis, studies Xenophon's theory of moral education. I would argue that Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* is a work on παιδεία in the author's own

³⁴ Hobden and Tuplin (2012), 1.

³⁵ Tamiolaki (2012), 563.

context. This type of education is moral, social and philosophical. It must be carried out by ideal leaders such as Cyrus the Great and Lycurgus, while it declines inevitably after these heroes' death. The ideal political leader in Xenophon's mind is pious, just, wise, diligent, generous, and in most cases thrifty; and he is also able to help his subjects achieve those virtues and lead them to harmony and happiness in a philosophical sense. In order to carry out this type of social education in a dark and highly dangerous political situation, the ideal leader's willingness to suffer all kinds of labours and his firm control of power must be secured. Therefore, Xenophon uses rhetorical skill in his *Hiero* to persuade his readers to believe that just kingship can also bring happiness in a philosophical sense for the monarch himself, while tyranny is the true source of all kinds of worries and pains for tyrants. What is more, certain dark arts of government, which must be considered immoral and cruel by modern standards, are tolerated and even praised in Xenophon's works, as long as their final aim is moral and positive. Xenophon's concept of παιδεία is highly political, but is sometimes also economic. In the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi*, a work composed in his old age, Xenophon provides a supplement to his educational theory in economic terms by arguing that the ability of obtaining and making good use of wealth is in itself a kind of ἀρετή, because wealth is a reliable insurance of peace and happiness in social life.

Part Three treats the application of Xenophon's theory of moral education in his literary works. His *Agesilaus* displays similar educational principles to the *Cyropaedia* and shows Xenophon's effort to make the positive influence of heroes on social morality everlasting by recording their monumental feats and daily behaviour after their death; while his *Oeconomicus* attempts to introduce successful experience in political and military affairs into the domestic sphere, and to establish guidelines for arranging private life well by borrowing from his theory of social education. As prototypes of the biography and agricultural writing flourished in Hellenistic and Roman age, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* and *Oeconomicus* make a great and lasting

influence on later literary composition in antiquity.

Part 1: Background of Xenophon's Thought on Moral Education

The background of Xenophon's thought contains many elements, for example the influence of his contemporary writers (Plato, Isocrates) and his unique experience in Persia and Sparta. This part only focuses on two aspects, which are most important for and relevant to moral education. Chapter 1 interprets Xenophon's view of the world he lived in as a historian on contemporary affairs; Chapter 2 analyses the influence and lasting mark of Socrates on Xenophon's literary composition.

Chapter 1: Xenophon's View of His Time

In most cases, a very valuable clue for analysing the background of a writer's composition and thought is his/her life experience. A writer's social status, the role he/she played in the events he/she describes, and even certain daily habits and other elements of private life can be helpful for later scholars to understand his/her works and views. Nevertheless, the application of this research method to the study of Xenophon is not often advantageous and sometimes can even cause trouble and confusion.

The main reason of this phenomenon is that the information of Xenophon's life we have is extremely scarce and uncertain. We do not know the dates of Xenophon's birth and death.³⁶ Édouard Delebecque believes that Xenophon was born in 426 B.C.,³⁷ but his view is not universally accepted. J.K. Anderson, the author of an influential modern biography of Xenophon, suggests that we can place Xenophon's birth 'a little after 430 B.C.'. ³⁸ However, even adopting Anderson's guess, which is already inexact and uncertain in itself, as a basis, we still do not know how long Xenophon lived and where and when he died.³⁹ We can only satisfy ourselves with the rough conclusion that Xenophon was born in the early 420s, and perhaps died in 355/4 B.C, which allows him time to finish his last extant work, the *Poroi*, in which he mentions the Social War (Xen. *Vect.* 4.40.) taking place from 357 to 355 B.C.⁴⁰ Yet we still have to face the challenge on the reliability of this date as well as the authenticity of Xenophon's authorship of the *Poroi* raised by the record of the ancient biographer Diogenes Laertius, who consults the work of Ctesiclides of Athens and claims that Xenophon passed away in 360/359 B.C. (Diog. Laert. 2.56.)

In the case of Xenophon's life experience we do know some basic facts.

³⁶ Badian (2004), 40.

³⁷ Delebecque (1957), 24.

³⁸ Anderson (1974), 10.

³⁹ Badian (2004), 38.

⁴⁰ For further discussion, see Part 2, Chapter 4 of this thesis.

Xenophon is an Athenian and names himself a disciple of Socrates. He served in the mercenary army of Cyrus the Younger, took part in the expedition to Babylon, and shared the commandship in the retreat from central Persia to Asia Minor. Later he served in Agesilaus' army as an Athenian exile and passed his later years in Corinth. However, quite a lot of detail in this summary, which might be of great importance for modern students on Xenophon, is either lacking or in dispute. Xenophon never names himself in the *Hellenica*.⁴¹ He does so in the *Anabasis*, yet most information presented in that work focuses on the expedition alone. Therefore, modern scholars have to use Diogenes Laertius' biography,⁴² which is very short and must contain certain mistakes, to reconstruct Xenophon's life experience. Unfortunately, Diogenes obviously does not possess a reliable biographical tradition on Xenophon's life either.⁴³ His report offers little that is new, so that Wilamowitz-Moellendorff even suggests that almost all of Diogenes' biography is more or less based on Xenophon's own works.⁴⁴ Although his claim may be considerably exaggerated⁴⁵ and is no longer believed nowadays, it remains true that efforts aiming to discover information of Xenophon's life from Diogenes' short and inaccurate biography are often proved to be frustrating.

Some other scholars try to obtain information by scrutiny of Xenophon's extant corpus. Martin Dreher attempts to clarify the case in Athens which resulted in Xenophon's exile,⁴⁶ and suggests that it took place in 395/394 B.C.⁴⁷ Marta Sordi puts forward a hypothesis that Xenophon published the first part of the *Anabasis* in

⁴¹ Anderson (1974), 146.

⁴² Breitenbach (1967), 1571.

⁴³ Badian (2004), 33.

⁴⁴ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1881), 330-335; Badian (2004), 36.

⁴⁵ As Badian points out, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's study, for example his understanding of the influence of Dinarchus' speech on Diogenes Laertius, is based on 'a favourite secret mark recognised only by a few chosen German scholars', therefore his conclusion is a mixture of 'truth, possibility and error'. See Badian (2004), 36-38. The basis of Wilamowitz-Moellendorff's supposition is that Diogenes Laertius' biography of Xenophon was copied from a lost work by Demetrius of Magnesia (1st century B.C.); while the latter's biography of Xenophon was in its turn derived from a court speech by Dinarchus written in the last third of the fourth century B.C. (Lipka (2002), 3) with much fictional addition. However, this complex hypothesis of literary transmission is no longer widely accepted in recent academic researches.

⁴⁶ Dreher (2004), 55.

⁴⁷ Dreher (2004), 63.

Sicily,⁴⁸ and that he had been invited by Dionysius I to Syracuse to lead a mercenary army.⁴⁹ These researches are innovative and suggestive, but are at the same time quite subjective and not universally accepted, therefore cannot offer solid and convincing evidence on Xenophon's life.

After realising how poor the historical evidence on Xenophon's life is, it is easy to understand why H.R. Breitenbach spends only eight pages talking about Xenophon's life in his ambitious and classic introduction to Xenophon written for the *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* in 1967, which takes up nearly 500 pages in total and aims to be complete. And even those eight pages⁵⁰ are still full of uncertain conjectures and hypotheses. In short, it would be very difficult for us to find useful information from materials on Xenophon's life to explore the background of the formation and development of his thought without high controversy, as these documents are insufficient and not of good quality themselves.

Another common approach to the study of a prolific writer is to establish a firm chronological order of all his/her extant writings and to analyse the trace and turning points of the development of the writer's ideas. This is also an almost impossible task for Xenophon's corpus. In the case of the *Hellenica*, some scholars believe that Books I-II and Books III-VII (the opinions on the exact cut-off point between the two parts are diverse) were written in different periods due to differences of their method and manner, but there is no mark indicating the time of composition of the first two mysterious books.⁵¹ Most of Xenophon's minor works, for example his *Spartan Constitution*, cannot be dated with any certainty.⁵² In 1928, Theodor Marschall published his dissertation *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons*, in which he attempts to fix the chronological order of Xenophon's whole

⁴⁸ Sordi (2004), 71.

⁴⁹ Sordi (2004), 77.

⁵⁰ Breitenbach (1967), 1571-1578.

⁵¹ Badian (2004), 46.

⁵² Badian (2004), 48.

corpus⁵³ by the combination of philological and historical methods. But as he admits himself, the method he adopts is insecure and subjective.⁵⁴ Although he is quite confident when he claims that ‘im ganzen glaube ich ein festes Schema für die zeitliche Abfolge einer Reihe von Xenophons Schriften gefunden zu haben’,⁵⁵ neither his method nor his conclusions are universally accepted by later scholars on Xenophon, and the problems of the chronological order of most of Xenophon’s works remain unsolved.

In sum, our knowledge about Xenophon’s life, including the dates of his birth and death, his life experience and the chronological order of his works, is extremely poor. Before we start any serious exploration of the background of Xenophon’s thought on moral education, it is very important to realise this basic fact first. We must always keep in mind that any research based on information on Xenophon’s life may lead to controversy, for the evidence is usually not universally accepted from the very beginning. Unfortunately, such confusions caused by the abuse of biographical evidence are not uncommon in Xenophonic scholarship. For example, J.K. Anderson claims that Xenophon belonged to a ‘post-war generation’ and was hardened to violent death.⁵⁶ In my opinion, this seems to be contradictory to the sympathy shown in the *Hellenica* towards people suffering from disasters of wars and cannot be proved from a historical point of view, because we know too little about Xenophon’s personal experience during the Peloponnesian War in his childhood. J.K. Anderson and Sarah Pomeroy believe that Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* is a record of his memory of Athenian domestic life in his youth⁵⁷ and reflects the economic structure of a normal οἶκος in Athens.⁵⁸ These hypotheses are still possible. But when they go further to suppose that the location of this οἶκος is in Scillus,⁵⁹

⁵³ Marschall (1928), 8.

⁵⁴ Marschall (1928), 17.

⁵⁵ Marschall (1928), 101.

⁵⁶ Anderson (1974), 49-50.

⁵⁷ Anderson (1974), 11.

⁵⁸ Pomeroy (2010), 33.

⁵⁹ Pomeroy (1994), 5.

where the Spartan king Agesilaus bestowed Xenophon land and property,⁶⁰ the prototype of Ischomachus' wife in this work is Xenophon's own wife Philesia,⁶¹ and Xenophon's basic motive in composing the *Oeconomicus* is to turn away from harsh and disappointing politics to the peaceful private realm,⁶² I believe they are actually guilty of over-interpretation and abuses of evidence regarding Xenophon's personal life. We know almost nothing about Xenophon's household and his wife Philesia, and there is no convincing cause to connect these elements to the content of the *Oeconomicus*. In my opinion, instead of showing Xenophon's despair of politics, the intention of the *Oeconomicus* is to adopt his successful experience in public affairs into the private sphere and make use of Xenophon's theory of moral education in daily life, as the third part of my dissertation shows.

Certain misuses of Xenophon's biographical materials also reflect a traditional bias regarding Xenophon's talent and moral character and are therefore harmful to the objectivity of academic research. For instance, in E.M. Soulis' *Xenophon and Thucydides* completed in 1972, the author claims that Xenophon enters the area of historiography without any particular historical knowledge and his motive is merely self-glorification.⁶³ In Soulis' view, Xenophon is 'a conceited lover of display, a hypocritical teacher of morality, an insincere historian, a flatterer of the strong men, a seeker of glory and apostate of his country, a self-centred individual'.⁶⁴ His praise of Epaminondas in the final chapters of the *Hellenica* is revenge upon his former patrons, namely Agesilaus and the Spartans, who failed to reward him for his flattery.⁶⁵ Such a man 'could not have been sincere in any sector of his life'.⁶⁶ Once we realise the paucity of reliable evidence on Xenophon's life, we can easily see the bias and error in Soulis' comments. We have very little evidence beyond Xenophon's

⁶⁰ Tuplin (2004), 264-266.

⁶¹ Anderson (1974), 174.

⁶² Pomeroy (1994), 5.

⁶³ Soulis (1972), 16.

⁶⁴ Soulis (1972), 189.

⁶⁵ Soulis (1972), 189.

⁶⁶ Soulis (1972), 53.

corpus to analyse his character and personal experience. And Soulis' negative image of Xenophon must ultimately come from subjective bias and unproved conjectures. In my opinion, up to now, the study of Xenophon's life still cannot offer sufficient and reliable evidence for us to understand the background of Xenophon's system of moral education. Therefore it is necessary to find an alternative approach.

In this chapter, I plan to study the background of Xenophon's theory of moral education by analysing his views on and attitudes towards contemporary events and figures of the world he lived in. My approach involves using Xenophon's *Hellenica* as the basic document, supplemented by additional historical information we can safely conclude that Xenophon must know. In my opinion, this approach can be justified for the following two reasons.

First of all, though the *Hellenica* is not a perfect work of political and military history, it is an invaluable and first-hand document reflecting Xenophon's own attitude to many affairs taking place in his time. Three of Xenophon's works on history, namely the *Hellenica*, the *Anabasis* and the *Agésilas* deal with events and figures of Xenophon's own time. Among these three writings, the scope of the *Hellenica* is indisputably the broadest. Although we cannot be sure that Xenophon did take part in most of the events he narrates⁶⁷ – due to lack of biographical information as discussed above – it is at least certain that the description in the *Hellenica* reflects the contemporary Greek world in Xenophon's eyes. Vivienne Gray convincingly proves that Xenophon's narrative system in the *Hellenica* is consistent⁶⁸ and unified.⁶⁹ The geographical sphere of the events in the first two books is still limited to the eastern Aegean and Attica, but in the following five books it is expanded to the whole eastern Greek world, including Asia Minor, the Peloponnese, Macedonia and Corcyra.⁷⁰ In this sense, Paul Cartledge justly points out that Xenophon should have called the *Hellenica* 'A History of My Times',

⁶⁷ Henry (1967), 33.

⁶⁸ Gray (1989a), ix.

⁶⁹ Gray (1991), 227-228.

⁷⁰ Henry (1967), 11.

which is the title adopted for the translation in the Penguin Classics series.⁷¹ What is more, Xenophon's *Hellenica* is not simply a record of facts; it also shows the author's effort to find out causes and explanations of contemporary events.⁷² For the study of Xenophon's thought, the *Hellenica* offers a precious document recording his understanding of what happened in his lifetime;⁷³ and it can be of great help for our study of Xenophon's idea of moral education, because as a moralist and philosopher, Xenophon naturally thinks about history in terms of the good and bad that men perform.⁷⁴

In the second place, the *Hellenica*'s incompleteness and its striking omission of important historical events should not be neglected.⁷⁵ His first two books are very concise and sometimes inaccurate;⁷⁶ while the remaining five books generally focus on affairs within the Peloponnese,⁷⁷ though their geographical scope is broader. The serious omissions throughout the *Hellenica* are hard to explain. One plausible explanation is that Xenophon deliberately passes over certain events as not deserving of mention,⁷⁸ as he claims in 4.8.1 himself. But obviously it is not the whole truth. For instance, one of the most striking omissions of the *Hellenica* is that it fails to record the foundation of the second Athenian Alliance,⁷⁹ which is described by to be not only amazing, but 'a scandal'.⁸⁰ Nevertheless, this omission is by no means due to Xenophon's ignorance or bias,⁸¹ as later references to the alliance, such as 5.4.60-6 and 6.5.1 clearly show that Xenophon knows of its existence and its importance. Xenophon also fails to show his readers a complete picture of the Theban hegemony,⁸² which no Greek writer would consider to be

⁷¹ Cartledge (1987), 61.

⁷² Riedinger (1991), 245.

⁷³ Dillery (1995), 3.

⁷⁴ Dillery (1995), 249.

⁷⁵ Hamilton (1997), 43-44.

⁷⁶ Anderson (1974), 62.

⁷⁷ Buckler (1980), 263; Gray (1989a), 179; Hornblower (1994), 4.

⁷⁸ Rhodes (2011), 72-73.

⁷⁹ Meiggs (1972), 401; Cawkwell (1973), 47.

⁸⁰ Cawkwell (1973), 57.

⁸¹ Gray (1989a), 178.

⁸² Gray (1989a), 179.

unimportant; nor does he mention the Greek mercenary army's expedition with Cyrus the Younger against the Persian king, in which he took part and whose leadership he shared during the retreat, as another historical work of his, the *Anabasis* shows. A thorough study of the cause of these omissions, as well as Xenophon and other classical writers' attitude to historiography, is of course beyond the task of this dissertation. What I plan to do to compensate for the shortcomings of the *Hellenica* as a reflection of Xenophon's view of his time is to draw historical details from other ancient writers, for example Thucydides, Diodorus of Sicily, Nepos and Plutarch, as long as I have good reason to believe that Xenophon must know these historical events, though he chooses not to record them in his *Hellenica*.

I. The Greek World Presented in Xenophon's *Hellenica*

a. Disorder and Confusion

The first feature of the Greek world displayed in the *Hellenica* is disorder and confusion. In modern scholarship, there is a tendency, as the works of Christopher Jones and Mogens Herman Hansen show, to amend the negative image of Greek world in the fourth century B.C. depicted by Xenophon and other contemporary writers.⁸³ But we still have to keep in mind that Xenophon must consider, perhaps subjectively, the history he recorded in the *Hellenica* as a particularly bloody and confusing period.⁸⁴ According to the statistics of Joseph M. Bryant, Xenophon records nearly forty cases of civic discord in his *Hellenica*.⁸⁵ The narrative of the *Hellenica* starts from the middle of the Peloponnesian war, (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.1) and ends with another brutal war at Mantinea in which 'while each party claimed to be victorious, neither was found to be any better off, as regards either additional

⁸³ Hansen (1991), 24.

⁸⁴ Dillery (1995), 3.

⁸⁵ Bryant (1996), 238.

territory, or city, or sway, than before the battle took place' (Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.27). And, as Xenophon comments himself, 'there was even more confusion and disorder in Greece after the battle than before (ἀκρισία δὲ καὶ ταραχὴ ἔτι πλείων μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐγένετο ἢ πρόσθεν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι)' (Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.27). Even in most modern scholars' eyes, Xenophon's complaint is fully understandable. As John Dillery explains:

Seldom before in the history of the Greek world had power proved so labile. Two hegemonies had fallen, and the third, that of Thebes, was soon to give way to Macedon, and all this in less than fifty years. Warfare was almost a constant feature of life during the period. Cities seemed continually to realign themselves in a series of alliances and confederations, and in place of cities new ways of concentrating power even came into being in certain areas. The world of the independent and aggressive polis was not to last for long.⁸⁶

Xenophon witnessed and experienced most of the dramatic changes in Greek political order listed above. In 404 B.C., Xenophon, who was still a youth, saw the final collapse of the Athenian Empire and the surrender of Athens, his fatherland and 'the centre of Greece and the whole inhabited world' (Xen. *Vect.* 1.6). In 372/371 B.C. and in his fifties, he experienced the fall of the Spartan hegemony he served, which was believed to have lasted for almost 500 years (Diod. Sic. 15.50.2) but was suddenly overthrown by Thebes. During these dramatic political changes, other small Greek poleis tried their best to secure their own interests and gave a series of performances of betrayal and compromise, unfaithfulness and ungratefulness, which must seem to be distasteful in Xenophon's eyes. After the defeat of the Athenian fleet in Syracuse in 413 B.C., many of her allies, including Byzantium, immediately revolted to the Lacedaemonians (Diod. Sic. 13.34.1-2; Plut. *Vit. Per.* 24.1). But in the following few years from 413 to 408 B.C. Byzantium surrendered to Athens and Lacedaemon in succession again, yet Anaxilaus, her chief leader responsible for the

⁸⁶ Dillery (1995), 4.

betrayal, was finally acquitted by Spartan generals, as even Spartans themselves consider it a normal thing to protect the polis' own interest regardless of diplomatic treaties (Xenophon, *Hell.* 1.3.18-19). As a result of the struggle among Sparta, Athens and Thebes, the established constitutions of small Greek poleis are frequently overthrown and civil wars or revolts broke out in many cities. The Lacedaemonians tried to establish oligarchy in other poleis, while Athens generally supported democracy in her allied cities (Thuc. 3.82.1-8). According to Aeneas Tacticus, serious revolts broke out in Argos, Heracleia Pontica, Corcyra and Chios during this period (Aen. Tact. 11.3-15). Even the Athenians themselves once tried to give a reformation to its democratic constitution in 411 B.C. (Thuc. 8.67.1-70.2; Diod. Sic. 13.34.2), but soon restored her traditional order, simply due to a naval defeat in the following year (Thuc. 8.97.1-98.4; Diod. Sic. 13.38.1-2). In 371 B.C., civil war among the Arcadians destroyed their dream of organising a league and resulted in the invasion of Sparta (Diod. Sic. 15.59.1-4). Xenophon also records the civil strife between two Elean parties, which finally led to external interference of the Arcadians in 365 B.C. (Xenophon, *Hell.* 7.4.15-16). Inner discord and tension seem to have become a universal phenomenon in the Greek world Xenophon lived in. Xenophon's attitude to these behaviours must be extremely negative, as he highly praises the faithfulness of Agesilaus (Xen. *Ages.* 1.1.13) and Phliasians (Xen. *Hell.* 7.2.17; 7.3.1) in his work. However, such glorious deeds were very rare in Xenophon's time.

In his *Citizen and Self in Ancient Greece*, Vincent Farenga discusses the existence of 'anxiety of civic collapse' in early fourth century B.C.,⁸⁷ which, in my opinion, must have influenced Xenophon's world view and historical composition. In the background of such disorder and confusion, Xenophon frequently expressed his feeling as a 'rootless individual'⁸⁸ in his extant writings, for example the *Anabasis*.⁸⁹ This feeling must have accompanied him all his life. The outbreak of the

⁸⁷ Farenga (2006), 349.

⁸⁸ Ma (2010), 515.

⁸⁹ Ma (2010), 518.

Peloponnesian War destroyed his peaceful childhood;⁹⁰ he left Athens after her defeat in the war and served in the mercenary army of Cyrus the Younger. After two years of the famous long march, he returned to Asia Minor, where the expedition started, and was still at a loss about what he should do, just like at the moment he went to consult the Delphic oracle following the advice of Socrates before the expedition (Xen. *An.* 3.1.4-10). The Athenian government banished him for some reasons⁹¹ and put his teacher, Socrates to death. Then he served the Spartans, the bitterest enemy of his fatherland, and perhaps spent his last years in Corinth after hearing the sad news that his son Gryllus fell for Athens in the battle against Thebes at Mantinea in 362 B.C. According to his view of the contemporary political situation and his personal feeling, such a world cannot create a safe, peaceful and just environment for Greek people to lead a moral, happy and glorious life. They had to live in mutual suspicion and lacked any sense of security, as Aeneas Tacticus describes:

Ἐν δὲ μὴ ὁμονοοῦσῃ πόλει καὶ ὑπόπτως πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἐχόντων χρὴ προνοοῦντα εὐλαβεῖσθαι τὰς μετ' ὄχλου ἐξόδους ἐπὶ θεωρίαν λαμπάδος καὶ ἵπποδρομίας καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγώνων ὅσαι γε ἱεροποιίαι πανδημεὶ ἐκτὸς τῆς πόλεως καὶ σὺν ὅπλοις πομπαὶ ἐκπέμπονται, ἔτι καὶ περὶ τὰς πανδήμους νεωλκίας καὶ τὰς συνεκφορὰς τῶν τελευτησάντων· ἔνι γὰρ καὶ ἐν τοιῷδε καιρῷ σφαλῆναι τοὺς ἑτέρους.

In a city in which harmony is wanting and where the citizens are mutually distrustful, you must exercise foresight and caution about the crowds that go out to see a torch-race, horse-racing, or any other contests — whenever that is, there are sacred rites in which the entire people engage outside the city, and processions that issue from the city under arms —; also about the public hauling up of ships and the obsequies of the dead. For it is possible on such an occasion

⁹⁰ Anderson (1974), 17-18.

⁹¹ Detailed discussion can be found in Dreher (2004), 55-63.

for one faction to be overthrown. (Aen. Tact. 17.1)

Here Aeneas Tacticus simply intends to give advice to generals in charge of city defence. But his narrative also reveals the misfortune Greeks suffered at that time. In a society without order and concord, even daily entertainments and festival celebrations, which were supposed to be joyful and holy, can be dangerous and disastrous for citizens. In Xenophon's eyes, such kinds of disorder and discord are chief causes of the moral corruption, weakness, and all kinds of disasters of the Greek world, as the following passages will show.

b. Large-scale Slaughters and Endless Violence

According to Diodorus' narrative, Xenophon's age was the period in which the greatest sea-battle (battle of Arginusae in 406 B.C.) (Diod. Sic. 13.98.5) and the greatest massacre (slaughter in Argos in 370/69 B.C.) (Diod. Sic. 15.57.3) among Greeks took place. In the time of the Athenian expedition against Syracuse, the execution of mutual prisoners is already nothing new among Greeks (Diod. Sic. 13.26.1), and the defeated Athenians and their allies suffered the same miserable destiny (Diod. Sic. 13.33.1). After that the mutual hatred among Greek opponents became more and more brutal and horrible. In this aspect Xenophon's ironical narrative of the aftermath of the sea-battle of Aegospotami in the *Hellenica* is quite noteworthy.

When Lysander gathered the allies to discuss the treatment of Athenian prisoners, many people began to accuse the Athenians over their former crimes against fellow Greeks: the Athenians used to threaten to cut off the right hand of every man taken alive; once they also threw the captured crews of Corinthian and Andrian triremes overboard. Therefore the Spartans and their allies finally decided to put all Athenian prisoners to death and cut the throat of Philocles, the very person who threw overboard Andrians and Corinthians before (Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.31-32). At the

same time, when the news of the defeat was sent to Athens, ‘during that night no one slept, all mourning, not for the lost alone, but for more for themselves, thinking that they would suffer such treatment as they had visited upon the Melians, colonists of the Lacedaemonians, after reducing them by siege, and upon the Histiaeans and Scionaeans and Toronaeans and Aeginetans and many other Greek peoples.’ (Xen. *Hell.* 2.2.3)

Here Xenophon’s critical attitude to the affair is rather explicit. Athenians received the punishment they deserved for their former maltreatment of Greek prisoners. While by taking revenge, Lacedaemonians and their allies committed another crime and sowed seeds of new hatred among Greeks, and so they caused further disasters in the Greek world in the near future. As a result, the suffering of the Greek people continued, as the Lacedaemonians did not desire that the Athenians should ever gain strength and tried to arrest Athenian exiles everywhere (Diod. Sic. 14.6.1-3). In 371 B.C., Agesilaus openly insulted the Thebans due to their mutual hatred and indirectly caused the conflict between Lacedaemon and Thebes and the collapse of Spartan hegemony (Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.19-20).

At the same time, the struggle among great powers also brought disasters to smaller Greek states, including their own allies. As Diodorus comments, the power politics Athens and Sparta played and their selfish ambitions were ‘open for all to see’ (Diod. Sic. 12.75.4). In the *Constitution of the Athenians*, the so-called ‘Old Oligarch’ severely criticises Athenian policy towards her allies in late fifth century B.C. He points out that Athenians kept their allies in poor and weak conditions on purpose (Xen. [*Ath. pol.*] 1.14); and while ‘each Athenian should individually control the resources of their allies’ (Xen. [*Ath. pol.*] 1.15), the allies ‘should have only what is enough to survive on, and should continue to cultivate the land, but without being able to plot revolt’ (Xen. [*Ath. pol.*] 1.15). Xenophon must to some extent share the view of the Old Oligarch, for he also indirectly criticises the injustice of the Athenians towards their allies in the second Athenian Alliance (Xen. *Vect.* 1.1). In

Xenophon's view, excessive exploitation of her friends must be taken as a disgrace and crime done by Athens, which marks the decline of moral standard in his time.

It is quite safe to conclude that Xenophon must hate and be tired of the internecine strife of Greeks. From time to time, the figures in the *Hellenica* also complain about it. When Agesilaus had to retreat from Asia Minor to reinforce his fatherland, his own soldiers were more willing to remain in Asia than to undertake a campaign against Greeks (Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.5). And Xenophon also arranges for the Theban envoy, Callistratus, to put forward an ironical question to Spartans: 'we all know that wars are forever breaking out and being concluded, and that we — if not now, still at some future time — shall desire peace again. Why, then, should we wait for the time when we shall become exhausted by a multitude of ills, and not rather conclude peace as quickly as possible before anything irremediable happens?' (Xen. *Hell.* 6.3.15)

c. Interference of External Enemies

In Xenophon's *Hellenica*, the existence of the Persian Empire is like a huge shadow throughout the whole period his narrative covers. It always menaces the freedom and security of the Greek world. In the opening passages Xenophon points out that the economic assistance of Pharnabazus (Xen. *Hell.* 1.1.24-25) and Cyrus the Younger (Xen. *Hell.* 1.5.1-3) were of great importance for Sparta's final success in the Peloponnesian War. Nevertheless, Persia was not simply a supporter of Sparta. Tissaphernes' real policy was to control the diplomatic situation so that 'no single Greek state should become strong, but all be kept weak through constant quarrelling among themselves' (Xen. *Hell.* 1.5.9). While Agesilaus won a series of victories in Asia Minor and began to challenge Persia's authority, the Persian King immediately distributed fifty talents of gold to Greek states (*Hell.Oxy.* 7.2) in order to mobilise them to make war upon the Lacedaemonians (Xen. *Hell.* 3.5.1-2). In 387 B.C., the

Peace of Antalcidas (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.31) ensured Persia's firm control of the Greek cities in Asia Minor. Although Xenophon claims that the treaty was favourable to Sparta (Xen. *Hell.* 5.1.36), he must also be aware that the peace was actually another diplomatic victory of Persia and disgrace for the Greek world, as the Athenians and Thebans were reluctant to accept it but were forced to (Diod. Sic. 14.110.3-4), and the general opinion on the treaty must be extremely negative, as Isocrates' *Panegyricus* (Isoc. *Paneg.* 177-178) and Lysias' *Olympic Oration* (Lys. 33.3, 33.5, 33.8) show. The external interference of Persia keeps the eastern Greeks under slavery and the mainland in confusion; while in the western Greek world, Sicily was being invaded and plundered by the army of Carthage (Diod. Sic. 13, 54.1-63.6).

The external interference is relevant to the morality of the Greek world in two aspects. First, the success of Persian power politics showed that the contemporary Greeks were in lack of the spirit of Panhellenism, which Xenophon takes as an important virtue in his ethical system shown in the *Agésilas*. Second, the closing menace of foreign powers makes the inner strife and disorder of Greek world appear to be more disgraceful and unbearable, and the need of correction more urgent.

d. Impiety of Greeks and Punishment of Gods

In Xenophon's eyes, beyond suffering from internal friction and external interference, an even more horrible menace the Greek world faces is the rage and punishment of the gods caused by Greeks' own impious behaviour.

Xenophon was a pious man who believes in divine justice.⁹² According to Diogenes Laertius, he was 'pious, fond of sacrificing, capable at discerning sacred matters and extremely devoted to Socrates' (Diog. Laert. 2.56). Though Xenophon does not often comment on the violation of sacred rules that he describes in the

⁹² Hau (2007), 175.

Hellenica,⁹³ judging from his other extant texts, it is still clear that he believed that the gods would punish the impious mortals (Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.1; *An.* 3.1.21-23; *Ages.* 1.13). In the *Hellenica*, we can find quite a lot of behaviour that is offensive to the gods. In 5.4.1, Xenophon reports that the Lacedaemonians who captured the acropolis of Thebes and therefore broke their holy oaths immediately received the punishment they deserve. Nevertheless, the instant reactions of gods towards impious behaviours are generally uncommon. In most cases, such deeds can temporarily go unpunished; but it does not mean, in Xenophon's eyes, they could keep going on without any costs in the end. After the Thirty had established their tyranny in Athens, Theramenes was dragged away from the altar while calling upon gods and men to witness the violence and was then executed in 404 B.C. (Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.55-56). In Elis, the arrogant Spartan king Agis broke into Olympia by force, offered sacrifices to Olympian Zeus, and then went on to plunder the city of Elis in 398 B.C. (Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.26). In Asia Minor, the Persian general Tissaphernes violated the oaths which he had sworn in negotiation with Agesilaus in 396 B.C. (Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.6). In Corinth in 392 B.C., some plotters from Argos, Athens and Boeotia deliberately picked the last day of the Euclea, a religious festival, to carry out a massacre, so that they would 'catch more people in the market-place' and kill them (Xen. *Hell.* 4.4.2-4). Again in Olympia, in 364 B.C., when Arcadians and Pisatans were holding the Olympic Games in Olympia (having captured it from the Eleans), the Eleans attacked Olympia (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.28-29) and pursued the enemy to the space between the senate house and the temple of Hestia (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.31), and they later cancelled all titles of champions in that 'non-Olympian Games (Ἀνολυμπιάς).' (Paus. 6.22, 2-3) While taking possession of Olympia, the leaders of the Arcadians also made use of the sacred treasures without fear (Xen. *Hell.* 7.4.33). After the battle of Aegospotami in 405 B.C., Lysander and Agis violated the oaths which the Lacedaemonians had sworn by the gods to the Athenians, and proposed to

⁹³ Pownall (1998), 251.

destroy Athens root and branch (Paus. 6.22, 2-3). And Dionysius I, the tyrant of Syracuse, also plundered a holy temple full of dedications in Tyrrhenia when he needed money (Diod. Sic. 15.14.3-4). All these events taking place in Xenophon's lifetime must be judged as guilty and intolerable by the historian's own moral and religious standards.

What results would these impious deeds lead to in Xenophon's opinion? Perhaps we can find the answer at the very end of the *Hellenica*. After describing the brutal scene of the battle of Mantinea (it is quite noteworthy that this episode 'contains the greatest number of references to the divine'⁹⁴ in the *Hellenica*), Xenophon comments:

Νενικηκέναι δὲ φάσκοντες ἑκάτεροι οὔτε χώρα οὔτε πόλει οὔτ' ἀρχῇ οὐδέτεροι οὐδὲν πλέον ἔχοντες ἐφάνησαν ἢ πρὶν τὴν μάχην γενέσθαι· ἀκρισία δὲ καὶ ταραχὴ ἔτι πλείων μετὰ τὴν μάχην ἐγένετο ἢ πρόσθεν ἐν τῇ Ἑλλάδι.

While each party claimed to be victorious, neither was found to be any better off, as regards either additional territory, or city, or sway, than before the battle took place; but there was even more confusion and disorder in Greece after the battle than before (Xen. *Hell.* 7.5.27).

Vivienne Gray observes that the choice of this battle as the end-point of the whole *Hellenica* reflects Xenophon's view as a philosopher; and in Xenophon's belief the undecided situation after the battle shows that the gods were holding the balance in the Greek world.⁹⁵ I partly agree with her view. But I want to point out that for Xenophon, who firmly believes in the connection between piety and divine grace,⁹⁶ such a balance must be the gods' punishment of the impious Greeks. Although every Greek state expected the battle of Mantinea to be decisive,⁹⁷ and everyone tried to gain the victory by force and trickery, the will of gods did not let

⁹⁴ Pownall (2004), 92.

⁹⁵ Gray (1989a), 179-180.

⁹⁶ Herman (2006). 318.

⁹⁷ Dillery (1995), 19-20.

any of their hopes come true.⁹⁸ And the guilty Greeks would remain in confusing disorder⁹⁹ and deep crimes.

In sum, as a political leader devoted to the principle of order,¹⁰⁰ a military general in favour of Panhellenism, a pious moralist who believed in the gods and supreme virtue, Xenophon must consider the Greek world he lived in to be a mess and full of crimes and faults. His description of it in the *Hellenica* is negative and even kind of pessimistic. In his view, a social and moral education, which is highly political, must be carried out in order to save the contemporary Greek world from its crimes.

II. Absence of Ideal Regime in Xenophon's Contemporary World

Therefore, from the narrative of the *Hellenica* and other historical facts that Xenophon must know we can conclude his general view of the Greek world he lived in. It was a world full of inner strife, external threat, impious and immoral behaviour; and two main causes of the situation were political discord among Greek poleis and the interference of the Persian Empire. In that case, it is reasonable to expect Xenophon would lay his hope on one of the existing Greek powers, supporting her to unite all Greek states, expel Persian interference and establish lasting peace and social justice. That was just what Xenophon's contemporary, the Athenian orator, Isocrates, did. In his *Panegyricus*, he proposed that Athens and Sparta should lead the Greek world and build up an alliance against the Persians (Isoc. *Paneg.* 185); and in his late years he turned his hope towards Macedonia (Isoc., *To Philip*, 154), another rising power in the Greek world. However, as we shall see in later chapters, the examples Xenophon chooses to explain his theory of moral education are mostly taken from the past: the ancient Persian Empire set up by Cyrus the Great, the

⁹⁸ Bryant (1996), 233; Hau (2007), 213.

⁹⁹ Riedinger (1991), 31.

¹⁰⁰ Xen. *Oec.* 8.3; Dillery (1995), 38.

legendary Spartan lawgiver Lycurgus, the conversation between the tyrant Hiero and the poet Simonides on the island of Sicily, a perhaps fictional¹⁰¹ Athenian householder Ischomachus, and so on. In other words, the models of Xenophon's moral education are in most cases utopian and have little to do with existing constitutions and figures. Nevertheless, the use of these examples does not mean that Xenophon is a conservative writer who always studies and appreciates the past. Instead, Xenophon's political thought not only represents the trend of his time, but also shows his distinctive and innovative features.¹⁰² In my opinion, Xenophon's choice was actually influenced by his negative view on the existing powers in his time.

We have Diodorus' overview of the political situation of the eastern Mediterranean world in 380/379 B.C. from a perspective of 300 years later. According to his description, there were three main powers standing at this time. Sparta controlled the mainland of Greece; Dionysius I enjoyed hegemony on Sicily; and Persia held Asia Minor; while the latter two 'paid court to the Spartan overlordship and sought alliance with them' (Diod. Sic. 15.23.3-5) and Thebes was about to rise. The political map in Xenophon's mind might have been slightly different. Obviously he pays relatively less attention to Sicily; and he also dislikes Thebes.¹⁰³ Persia serves as an interferer in Greek affairs behind the curtain; and his main attention in the *Hellenica* focuses on Athens, his fatherland, and the Peloponnesus, the place he lived in during his later years. On the other hand, in his view, neither contemporary Athens nor Sparta offers a satisfactory example of good government, which would be suitable to carry out his proposal of social education.

a. Capricious Athenian Democracy

¹⁰¹ A different view can be found in Pomeroy (1994), 259-260.

¹⁰² Brock (2004), 256-257.

¹⁰³ Henry (1967), 205; Riedinger (1991), 190.

In the case of Athens, Xenophon inherited, in his first two books of the *Hellenica*, the critical attitude against Athenian democracy of Thucydides. Xenophon ironically describes the dramatic change in the Athenian people's attitude to Alcibiades, an able general and the hope of Athens in the last phase of the Peloponnesian War. When he came back from exile in 407 B.C., Alcibiades at first did not even dare to disembark and looked to his close friends to protect his safety (Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.18-19); but as his apology before the Council and the Assembly was successful, nobody dared to question him anymore because the Assembly 'would not have tolerated it' (Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.20). Then Alcibiades was immediately proclaimed commander-in-chief with absolute authority. However, when Alcibiades suffered loss in the battle of Notium, the Athenians suddenly became angry and sent ten generals to replace him (Xen. *Hell.* 1.5.16-17). Then Alcibiades had to condemn himself to exile (Diod. Sic. 13.74.2-4) in order to shut himself off from the rage of the Athenian mob. Later, some Athenian generals won the battle of Arginusae but failed to rescue some sailors on disabled vessels due to a heavy storm (Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.35). Those of them who chose to return to Athens were tried (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.7) and wrongly condemned (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.8) in an unlawful trial (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.12-15) and were all put to death (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.34). But soon the Athenians regretted their decision and punished the accusers of these loyal generals and victims (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.34-35).

In his narrative, Xenophon's negative attitude towards the Athenian democracy at that time is quite clear.¹⁰⁴ He expressed his opinion in the charge of Euryptolemus that the Athenian Assembly was always agitated, unreasonable and inconsistent (Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.33). Such an unwise government cannot work well at critical moments, as the tragedy of the Sicilian expedition (Thuc. 7.68.3-4) and the final fall of Athens in the Peloponnesian War show. In the theoretical level, Xenophon once also argues in his *Memorabilia* that democracy also governs by force instead of law, which makes it not quite different from tyranny or oligarchy (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.45). Xenophon would

¹⁰⁴ Dover (1974), 5.

agree with the Old Oligarch's comment that there were two main drawbacks in the contemporary Athenian democracy: it was not reliable or just (Xen. [*Ath.pol.*] 2.17); and it was jealous of and hostile towards any prominent individuals (Xen. [*Ath.pol.*] 2.18). Xenophon always prefers order; and he also exalts heroes and his great teacher Socrates, who was put to death in Athens under the government of democracy. In that case, Xenophon must consider that the faults of disordered Athenian democracy were serious and inexcusable.¹⁰⁵ Though he loved his fatherland all his life and always took patriotism as a praiseworthy virtue (Xen. *Ages.* 2.1), he still holds a negative attitude to the constitution Athens adopted.¹⁰⁶

b. Irresponsibility and Decline of Sparta

Xenophon once served Agesilaus and the Spartans in Asia Minor and in the war against Thebes (Diog. Laert. 2.51); and the fact that he favours Sparta in the *Hellenica* is undeniable.¹⁰⁷ His view of the Spartan constitution is generally positive (Xen. *Lac.* 1.1). In spite of that, Xenophon does not simply believe that a good constitution must lead to good government, a view which is reflected in his negative account of certain events relevant to Spartans in the *Hellenica*.

One explicit instance is his critical description of the government of the Thirty in Athens. With support from the Lacedaemonians, these thirty men established an oligarchy in Athens in 404 B.C., tried their enemies (Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.12), showed their contempt for justice and laws (Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.13), enslaved the Athenian people by force (Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.17-19; 2.3.30), extracted money from rich citizens (Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.21), banished virtuous Athenians (Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.20-21) from their fatherland (Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.2), and were finally overthrown by popular revolt (Xen. *Hell.* 2.4.24). Xenophon must know well that the oligarchy of the Thirty was established and

¹⁰⁵ Roberts (1994), 96.

¹⁰⁶ Roberts (1994), 73.

¹⁰⁷ Henry (1967), 205; Riedinger (1991), 123.

controlled by the Spartans (Diod. Sic. 14.6.1-3); and readers of the *Hellenica* can also easily see that it was, though Xenophon does not point it out directly. He also indirectly blames the Spartans' selfishness in another passage. In 400 B.C., shortly after their victory in the Peloponnesian War, the Spartans were invited by the Ionians to protect them against the Persian general Tissaphernes (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.3). Spartans sent Thibron to help the Ionians. And Thibron also asked for three hundred cavalymen from Athens (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.4). But he was soon summoned back and then banished, because he was accused of 'allowing his soldiers to plunder their friends' (Xen. *Hell.* 3.1.8). In Xenophon's eyes, such a deed against the spirit of Panhellenism must be taken as an immoral disgrace of Thibron himself and a proof of Spartan soldiers' selfishness; and he adopts an indirect and Socratic style to criticise the Spartan regime and its vulnerability to corruption in his *Hellenica*.¹⁰⁸ Therefore, we can see that Xenophon's attitude to Sparta is also not totally positive.

Another noteworthy example is Xenophon's narrative of the conspiracy of Cinadon (Xen. *Hell.* 3.3.5-11). Although the ephors managed to oppress the conspirators, Xenophon's close observation and detailed record of the whole affair clearly indicate that he must have realised that there are fierce conflicts and serious social problems within the Spartan society, which serve as another obstacle to the government and development of Sparta and foretell its political crisis in the future.

A more decisive reason for Xenophon to exclude Sparta from the list of examples of ideal government must be the fact that Sparta had already lost its hegemony once and for all when Xenophon began to compose most of his works in his old age. As an experienced general, though Xenophon still praised the Spartans' perseverance (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.16) and their victory (Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.30-32) after their defeat at Leuctra, he must realise that the hegemony of Sparta had passed. From then on, the Lacedaemonians never recovered their strength (Nep. *Vit. Ages.* 7.1) and were short of citizen soldiers (Diod. Sic. 15.63.1). They were even forced to turn to their

¹⁰⁸ Gish (2009), 363.

bitterest former enemy, the Athenians for help before the battle of Mantinea (Diod. Sic. 15.63.2).

What is the cause of Sparta's decline? As a pious man, Xenophon naturally ascribes it to the will of the gods.¹⁰⁹ He hints in the *Hellenica* (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.7-8) that it was through the Spartans' own actions that they lost the favour of the gods and incurred divine wrath.¹¹⁰ Their loss at Leuctra was a punishment for their disgraceful seizure of the Cadmeia in time of peace.¹¹¹ This impiety is closely connected with the corruption of traditional Spartan morality. Xenophon comments in the *Spartan Constitution* as follows:

If anyone asked me, whether I believe that the laws of Lycurgus still remain unchanged today, by Zeus, I could not state this with confidence any more. For I know that previously the Lacedaemonians preferred to live with each other at home with modest resources rather than to suffer corruption by flattery as harmosts in the cities. And I know that formerly they were afraid of being seen with money, while now some even pride themselves on its possession. I am aware that in the old days foreigners were expelled and living abroad was not permitted so that the citizens would not be led into self-indulgent ways by foreigners. By contrast, nowadays I know that those who are reputed to be the leading men are doing their best to continue to serve as harmosts abroad for the rest of their lives. There was a time when they cared to be worthy of leadership, now they take much more trouble to be rulers than to be worthy to rule. As a consequence, whilst in the past the Greeks used to go to Lacedaemon and ask them to take the lead against those they thought were doing wrong, now many call on each other to help prevent them from taking the lead again. So it is no surprise that they blame the Spartans for their blatant disobedience towards the god and the Lycurgan Laws (Xen. *Lac.* 14.1-7).

¹⁰⁹ Hau (2007), 179.

¹¹⁰ Pownall (1998), 257.

¹¹¹ De Ste. Croix (1972), 162-163.

Xenophon's attitude here is quite clear. Sparta's loss of political hegemony starts from the corruption of her morality. When the Spartans no longer loved their fatherland, no longer lived in thrift, no longer upheld justice for the whole Greek world, no longer cared about the gods, their hegemony's collapse became fatal and unavoidable. Of course, it is not reasonable to expect that such a state would regain her former prestige and re-establish justice and all kinds of virtues which she lacked herself.

c. Moral Corruption of Persia

Xenophon's feelings towards Persia were mixed¹¹² and sometimes hard to distinguish.¹¹³ In my opinion, his attitude to Persia is similar to his view of Sparta. On the one hand, he extols in his *Cyropaedia* the monarchy Cyrus the Great established and praises Cyrus the Younger¹¹⁴ in the *Anabasis*. On the other hand, he also believed that contemporary Persians had lost the traditional moral virtues bequeathed by Cyrus the Great. According to Xenophon's description, the Persian king was a brutal and terrible man (Xen. *An.* 3.1.17-18); Persians in his time were impious towards the gods and their holy oaths (Xen. *An.* 3.1.21-23); their former virtues had already disappeared as they followed bad examples of incompetent kings after Cyrus the Great (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.5) so that they became 'less reverent toward the gods, less dutiful to their relatives, less upright in their dealings with all men, and less brave in war than they were of old' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.27).

In sum, Xenophon believed that none of the existing powers, namely Athens, Sparta and Persia, were admirable or worth imitating. His attitude to Thebes, another political power active in the Greek mainland, must also be positive.¹¹⁵ The Athenian

¹¹² Hornblower (1994), 6.

¹¹³ Hirsch (1985), 4.

¹¹⁴ Luccioni (1953), 144.

¹¹⁵ In his extant works, Xenophon seldom gives positive comments on Thebes and even talks very little about her famous heroes, namely Epaminondas and Pelopidas. Because both Athens (his fatherland) and Sparta (the state

democracy was unreliable and hostile to heroes; Sparta and Persia possessed better constitutions, but both failed to establish good government because of a lack of virtue and virtuous political leaders. Therefore, a new kind of leadership must be devised to rescue the Greek world from crimes, disorders and all kinds of disasters.

III. Increasing Influence of Individual Politicians and Generals in Xenophon's Time

A noteworthy phenomenon in Xenophon's time is that individual generals and politicians are quite important and prominent, and play critical roles in many political affairs. This seems to be universal across the Greek world. In Athens, after escaping the trial of his personal enemies, Alcibiades went to Sparta and successfully persuaded the Lacedaemonians to restart the war against Athens (Thuc. 6, 89.1-93.4). When Athens was about to be defeated, Alcibiades suddenly decided to return to his native city (Diod. Sic. 13.37.2-3) and reversed the situation (Plut. *Vit. Lys.* 3.1). His continuous successes made people believe that he was invincible (Plut. *Vit. Alc.* 35.2). The activity of Alcibiades had a great influence on the fate of Athens in the later phases of the Peloponnesian War. In Sparta, Brasidas started his glorious military career at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War (Thuc. 2.25.2). He won a series of victories in northern Greece (Diod. Sic. 12, 67.1-68.6) and showed his brilliance in the sea-battle near Pylos (Thuc. 4.11.4). Thucydides praises Brasidas for being 'the first Lacedaemonian abroad who gained a reputation for being in all aspects a good man', and he 'left behind him a confident belief that the other Lacedaemonians also were of the same stamp' (Thuc. 4.81.1-3). After his death the allies gave him a glorious public burial; and the Amphipolitans 'fenced in his monument and have ever since made offerings to him as a hero, giving honours and instituting games and

Xenophon serves for) used to be bitter enemies of Thebes, Xenophon's silence to this hostile state is understandable.

yearly sacrifices' (Thuc. 5.11.1). After Brasidas, another Spartan general, Lysander became famous in the whole Greek world for his victory in the Peloponnesian War (Plut. *Vit. Lys.* 18.2). The Samians even voted that their festival of Hera should be called Lysandreia (Λυσάνδρεια) (Plut. *Vit. Lys.* 18.4). And Xenophon's own leader, Agesilaus, became a third prominent Spartan general and 'one of Sparta's strongest kings' ¹¹⁶ after seizing power from Lysander (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 7.4-5; 8.1-4). In Thebes, 'no general as able as theirs had yet been seen in Greece, not even in Sparta'. ¹¹⁷ Therefore, although the Thebans had won a victory in Thessaly, they still believed that they were the loser because of their loss of the excellent general Pelopidas (Diod. Sic. 15.81.1), who held the office of Boeotarch in Thebes almost continuously. ¹¹⁸ Although Pelopidas died in a foreign country in the absence of wife, children and kinsmen as a commoner, his dead body was still escorted and crowned by lots of people and cities eager to show him honour (Plut. *Vit. Pel.* 34.3). And Epaminondas, another general of Thebes was even more prominent, because as Nepos comments, 'before the birth of Epaminondas, and after his death, Thebes was subject constantly to the hegemony of others; but, on the contrary, so long as he was at the head of the state, she was the leading city of all Greece' (Nep. *Vit. Epam.* 10.4). And his glorious deeds even made Nepos believe that 'this fact shows that one man was worth more than the entire body of citizens' (Nep. *Vit. Epam.* 10.4). Generally speaking, 'in the judgement of antiquity, the Theban hegemony was entirely the work of Epaminondas and Pelopidas'. ¹¹⁹

At the same time, quite a few individuals in Greek states outside central Greece obtained supreme power and established tyranny, some of whom Xenophon must have known or at least heard of. First, Xenophon must know the political situation in

¹¹⁶ Rhodes (2006), 205.

¹¹⁷ Holm (1896), 102.

¹¹⁸ Stylianou (1998), on 81.4, 501.

¹¹⁹ Buckler (1980), 220.

Syracuse and the tyranny of Dionysius I.¹²⁰ Though Marta Sordi's hypothesis that Xenophon had served in Dionysius' mercenary army¹²¹ might not be correct, his interest in Sicily can still be proved by his *Hiero*. Second, Dionysius I was quite active on mainland Greece. He sent horse teams to take part in the Olympic Games (Diod. Sic. 14.109.1-6); he invited Plato, the most prominent student of Socrates, to his court (Diod. Sic. 15.7.1); and he also sent choruses to Athens to perform a tragedy that he composed (Diod. Sic. 15.74.1). Therefore, Xenophon should have known well about Dionysius' deeds and government in Syracuse. In 406 B.C., Dionysius seized supreme power in Syracuse (Diod. Sic. 13, 94.4-95.1) and established a tyranny (Diod. Sic. 13.95.4-6) which was unrestricted¹²² and lasted 38 years and had great influence on the Mediterranean world (Diod. Sic. 13.96.4). In northern Greece, the hegemony of Pherae was 'the doing of one man'.¹²³ Jason of Pherae, who is described by Xenophon as a charismatic mercenary leader,¹²⁴ claimed his supremacy in Greece (Diod. Sic. 15.60.1-2), a fact which received Xenophon's attention in the *Hellenica* (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.4-12). In Asia Minor, Maussollos rose up and united six poleis into one big city.¹²⁵ And Clearchus, a student of Isocrates and Plato in Athens, also established a tyranny at Heracleia on the Black Sea and adopted many methods of government employed by Dionysius in Syracuse (Diod. Sic. 15.81.5). In short, Xenophon's time was an age of individual heroes, as Diodorus later summarised:

For among the generation of Epaminondas were famous men: Pelopidas the Theban, Timotheus and Conon, and Chabrias and Iphicrates, Athenians all, and besides, Agesilaus, the Spartan, who belonged to a slightly older generation. (Diod. Sic. 15.88.2.)

¹²⁰ For Greeks' general knowledge and frequent contact with Dionysius in this historical period, see Rhodes and Osborne (2003), no. 10, no. 33, no. 34.

¹²¹ Sordi (2004), 77.

¹²² Hammond (1959), 473.

¹²³ Bury and Meiggs (1975), 366.

¹²⁴ Davies (1993), 240.

¹²⁵ Strabo, 13.1.59; Davies (1993), 244.

The rise of these famous military generals, as well as many other distinguished individuals in political and military spheres at this time was by no means a coincidence. The dramatic change of political situation weakened the power of old clans and established rules in many states; at the same time, frequent wars also offered good opportunities for military talents to establish their fame in the Greek world in their youth, and therefore made room for the success of individual heroes. It is quite noteworthy that the rise of these individuals often challenged the established authorities in their own poleis and offered the possibility of certain innovations and reform of the old society.¹²⁶

In the fifth century Sparta, the ambitions of prominent individuals were always balanced and restricted by the council of elders and ancient Spartan customs. The ambitious king, Pausanias, had been brought to trial by the council of elders (Paus. 3.5.2) and was later killed by the ephors (Nep. *Vit. Paus.* 5.1-5). When his guilt was revealed, even his mother agreed that he deserved death (Nep. *Vit. Paus.* 5.3). After Brasidas' glorious death, the ephors honoured his mother because she 'placed the fair name of her country above the fame of her son' (Diod. Sic. 12.74.2-4). This modesty and devotion to the fatherland seemed to disappear soon as time went on. When Callicratides was nominated as general of Spartan army, Lysander's friends refused to obey him because they were loyal only to Lysander (Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.4). When the Lacedaemonians sent their fleet to reinforce Chios, they made Aracus admiral and Lysander vice-admiral, but gave the actual commander to Lysander alone (Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.6-7). After seizing power from Lysander, the king Agesilaus also successfully won the support of the ephors and the council of elders (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 4.2-4), and so could deal with political and military affairs according to his own will, even putting plotters to death without due process of law in an emergency, which had never been done before in the case of free Spartans (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 32.6). In Athens, people disliked Alcibiades because he was 'too powerful and too great to be content with a

¹²⁶ Schachermeyr, F. (1960), 218.

private station' and suspected him as a threat to democracy (Nep. *Vit. Alc.* 3.4-5); and Alcibiades is isolated in many ways from the Athenian *demos*.¹²⁷ In Thebes, Epaminondas could still make a prime contribution to the city's success when he was no longer a boeotarch (Diod. Sic. 15.71.6-7; Nep. *Vit. Epam.* 7.1-3). Once he also refused to obey the people's decree (Nep. *Vit. Epam.* 7.3-5) and extended his and other generals' offices by four months (Plut. *Vit. Pel.* 25.1) so that they could finish a vital battle. And all of these were finally acquitted due to Epaminondas' fame and wisdom.

Living in such an age, Xenophon paid close attention to these distinguished individuals and used some of them as prototypes of the heroes in his works on moral education. Nevertheless, with the exception of Agesilaus (Nep. *Vit. Ages.* 1.1) and very few others,¹²⁸ Xenophon seldom praised the morality of these contemporary political leaders, because many of them were actually ambitious, short of virtues and caused more harm than good. For example, Alcibiades' character was mixed and he 'never excelled either in faults or in virtues' (Nepos, *Vit. Alc.* 1.1). His extravagance, indifference, licentiousness and lack of self-control were evident (Nepos, *Vit. Alc.* 1.2-4); his fame was always a matter of dispute¹²⁹ and the harm he did to his fatherland was undeniable.¹³⁰ Again, Lysander's great reputation was gained 'rather by good fortune than by merit' (Nepos, *Vit. Lys.* 1.1). He was the object of mockery in the comic poet Theopompus' work for his dishonest promise to the Greek world (Plutarch, *Vit. Lys.* 13.4-5); he was so cruel to his opponents that 'the sole punishment that could satisfy his wrath was the death of his enemy' (Plutarch, *Vit. Lys.* 19.1). These evil characteristics caused the Lacedaemonians to be bitterly hated by all Greece because of him (Nepos, *Vit. Lys.* 1.3). Similarly, though Dionysius I had united the western Greeks to fight against Carthage's invasion (Diod. Sic.

¹²⁷ Ferrario (2012), 354.

¹²⁸ For example, Jason of Pherae, whom Xenophon 'depicts with some sympathy and gives his death relative dignity'. See Pownall (2004), 103.

¹²⁹ Hatzfeld (1951), 357.

¹³⁰ Kagan (1987), 420.

14.46.1-4), his image in Xenophon's mind could not be positive. He was so hated by his subjects that he 'was compelled by fear to wear an iron corselet under his tunic' (Diod. Sic. 14.2.2), and his leadership 'led to the destruction of his allies and the enslavement of his fellow citizens' (Diod. Sic. 14.66.1-5). In sum, 'Xenophon gives [in the *Hellenica*] numerous examples of characters induced to arrogance and overconfidence by good fortune, but none of characters who handle good fortune with moderation'.¹³¹ Such figures cannot offer proper choices for Xenophon to carry out his plan of social education.

On the other hand, in his narrative of the deeds of certain generals such as Callicratidas and Agesilaus, who were both able and virtuous, we can find some scenes totally different from the confusing and pessimistic situations Xenophon usually describes. In his opinion these distinguished leaders were the true hopes of Greek world's future. After overcoming many difficulties and capturing Methymna, Callicratidas showed the true spirit of Panhellenism that Xenophon advocated by setting all Methymnaean captives free and claiming that, while he was commander, no Greek should be enslaved if he could help it (Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.14-15). And Agesilaus, the hero of Xenophon's prose encomium, was also a glorious and exceptional figure in the *Hellenica*. While knowing his opponent Tissaphernes had broken his holy oath, he still kept his promise in order to win the favour of the gods (Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.11) and finally defeated his enemy (Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.20-25). After gaining a series of victories in Asia Minor, he restrained his ambition and hurried back to rescue Sparta due to his loyalty to his fatherland (Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.3). His kindness not only enriched his friends, but also benefited barbarians, such as Pharnabazus' son (Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.3). Such a historical figure, though a bit idealised,¹³² is just what Xenophon looks for. Only such leaders can help the Greek world to get rid of disorder and confusion, protect it against interference of external

¹³¹ Hau (2007), 131.

¹³² For detailed discussion, see Part 3, Chapter 1, especially Section 5 in it.

enemies and re-establish social justice and morality.

In sum, the rise of distinguished political and military leaders was an undeniable fact in Xenophon's time. For social morality this phenomenon was a double-edged sword. If the leaders are evil in nature, they can only create more disasters in the Greek world and break up the traditional order of society; but if they possess all the required virtues, they can also offer the best choice for Xenophon to carry out his plan of social reform and re-establishment of moral principles in society.

IV. Conclusion

In conclusion, I believe that Xenophon's view of the situation of his time, which is partly reflected in his *Hellenica* and partly summarised from contemporary historical events he must have known, comprises one important aspect of the background for the birth and development of his theory of moral education for the society he lived in.

Xenophon's description of his time is generally negative. It was full of disorder and immoral behaviour. It suffered the interference of the Persian Empire and faced the menace of enslavement, yet was still lacking the spirit of Panhellenism and weakened by mutual hatred and discord among different states. Xenophon's theory of moral education was an attempt to solve these urgent problems that the Greeks faced. It intends to be practical and is therefore less theoretical but relatively more straightforward than Plato's or Aristotle's political systems.

Xenophon expressed his disappointment with the government of all important existing powers in his times. He criticises the unreliability of Athenian democracy; he admires the ancient constitutions of Sparta and Persia but also points out their decline due to the corruption of social morality. As a result, Xenophon's examples for his moral education come mainly from the remote past or fictional scenes. This feature should not be simply taken as proof of Xenophon's conservatism, as it

actually reflects Xenophon's effort to reform the world he lived in and abolish certain out-dated social rules, though he often disguised this real intention under the cover of ancient authorities and legendary figures.

Xenophon's time witnessed the rise of many powerful individual politicians and generals. These figures' influence on the Greek world largely depends on their own moral qualities. Based on this historical experience, Xenophon frequently emphasised in his works that a virtuous character of political leader possessing all required positive qualities, is the precondition for any effective social education in morality to be carried out.

Chapter 2: Influence of Socrates on Xenophon's Thought on Moral Education

Diogenes Laertius, a third-century A.D. biographer, preserved for us a story on the acquaintance of Socrates and Xenophon, which seems to be widely known in antiquity:

Xenophon, the son of Gryllus, was a citizen of Athens and belonged to the deme Erchia; he was a man of rare modesty and extremely handsome. The story goes that Socrates met him in a narrow passage, and that he stretched out his stick to bar the way, while he inquired where every kind of food was sold. Upon receiving a reply, he put another question, 'And where do men become good and honourable? (ποῦ δὲ καλοὶ καὶ ἀγαθοὶ γίνονται ἄνθρωποι)' Xenophon was fairly puzzled; 'Then follow me,' said Socrates, 'and learn.' From that time onward he was a pupil of Socrates. (Diog. Laert. 2.48)

Regardless of its reliability, this anecdote reveals for us the relationship between Xenophon and Socrates in later generations' eyes: Xenophon considered himself a follower of Socrates from his youth on, and his aim of studying Socratic philosophy is to pursue virtue and to become a 'good and honourable man (καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός)'. Therefore, it is natural that the moral philosophy of Socrates would leave an evident mark on Xenophon's own idea on moral education. But can we take Xenophon as a competent and loyal follower of Socrates? In many cases, modern scholars generally believe that this is quite doubtful.¹³³ The problem is not that Xenophon is dishonest or does not respect his teacher, but that he is not a qualified philosopher at all¹³⁴ and is not clever enough to grasp the essence of Socrates' teachings. On this issue Bertrand Russell's comment is typical:

Let us begin with Xenophon, a military man, not very liberally endowed with

¹³³ Delatte (1933), 123.

¹³⁴ Bandini and Dorion (2000), 90-91.

brains, and on the whole conventional in his outlook... There has been a tendency to think that everything Xenophon says must be true, because he had not the wits to think of anything untrue. This is a very invalid line of argument. A stupid man's report of what a clever man says is never accurate, because he unconsciously translates what he hears into something he can understand. I would rather be reported by my bitterest enemy among philosophers than by a friend innocent of philosophy.¹³⁵

Perhaps Bertrand Russell's criticism is too harsh, as it would be unfair to call Xenophon 'a stupid man'. Nevertheless, anyone having compared Xenophon and Plato's Socratic writings can easily realise that the former's philosophical talent must be far inferior to the latter,¹³⁶ and Xenophon's understanding of Socrates' teachings is sometimes superficial and incorrect, as Bertrand Russell points out. In his *History of Greek Philosophy*, William Guthrie calls Xenophon 'a gentleman in the old-fashioned sense of the term'¹³⁷ and considers that Xenophon's *Apology* is 'of little or no independent value'.¹³⁸ J.K. Anderson contends that Xenophon still deserves to be called a philosopher, yet points out at the same time that Xenophon's philosophy is 'a mixture of practical common sense and traditional morality, combined with a piety that is too easily dismissed as foolish superstition, or the vain repetition of rituals'.¹³⁹ In my opinion, Xenophon's lack of interest in profound philosophical doctrines is evident. For example, in his *Symposium* Xenophon touches on a core question in Socrates' ethical system: can virtue be taught at all? However, unlike his contemporary writer Plato, who made thorough and excellent discussion on it in many of his important dialogues, Xenophon obviously failed to realise the importance of this question in Socrates' system of ethical philosophy, and makes his Socrates divert the topic by starting to commend an attractive dancing-girl (Xen.

¹³⁵ Russell (1946), 102-103.

¹³⁶ Bowen (1998), 8.

¹³⁷ Guthrie (1969), 334.

¹³⁸ Guthrie (1969), 340.

¹³⁹ Anderson (1974), 2.

Symp. 2.5-7). The existence of such instances proves that the influence of Socratic ethical doctrines on Xenophon must be limited due to the latter's poor understanding of philosophical issues.

Nevertheless, if Xenophon failed to learn from Socrates how to study philosophy, he still managed to remember some contents, styles and approaches of Socratic teaching, as well as what Socrates was like in his daily life. These two elements leave lasting marks in almost every work of the extant corpus of Xenophon and contribute to the formation of Xenophon's own system of moral education.

I. Recognisable Influence of Socratic Teachings on Xenophon¹⁴⁰

¹⁴⁰ The influence of Socrates on Xenophon is relevant to the reliability of Xenophon and Plato's report of Socrates and therefore also relevant to the famous 'Socratic question', which is extremely complex and highly controversial (Dorion (2009), 93), and impossible to be totally clarified by extant evidence once for all (Brickhouse and Smith (1989), 235) as only one part of the tradition on Socrates is consistent (Micheline (2003), 46). Generally speaking, modern scholars value Plato's record of Socrates in his early works more than that of Xenophon; therefore Plato's Socrates is usually treated as historical rather than literary (Micheline (2003), 45). Thomas C. Brickhouse and Nicholas D. Smith summarise that for the trial of Socrates, Plato's account is generally preferred, as he was present in the court, while Xenophon had to rely on second-hand materials (Brickhouse and Smith (1989), 6). Guthrie comments that Xenophon's *Symposium* is 'an imaginative work' (Guthrie (1969), 343); and he argues that Xenophon in his *Memorabilia* 'is not concerned to fill in the historical, biographical or local background' (Guthrie (1969), 346). Nevertheless, these opinions are more or less influenced by the great achievement Plato makes in the history of philosophy and theology, as well as the misleading bias that Xenophon is a foolish writer who cannot understand Socratic philosophy at all (Russell (1946), 102-103). From a historical view, there is still no convincing evidence to show why Plato's *Symposium* must be less 'imaginative' in comparison to Xenophon's; while sometimes Plato's reports of Socrates are also problematic and contradictory. For instance, in my opinion, the claim Socrates made in Plato's *Apology* that he is the wisest man as other people know nothing but think they know a lot (Pl. *Ap.* 21b-d) is very offensive and not suitable for the purpose of an apology in reality; and the charming and lengthy discourse of Socrates on soul before his death in the *Phaedo* is very rhetorical and too long to be recited accurately later by anyone, even though he or she was present, therefore is quite possible to be created or thoroughly reworked by Plato. What is more, Socrates' doctrine in Plato's later works developed significantly and became more abstract and theoretical (Skemp (1967), 1), which seems to suggest that Plato's purpose in composing his dialogues is not always to present Socrates' teaching word for word faithfully. In that case, it is not proper to suppose that whenever Xenophon offers any information beyond or contradictory to the evidence in Plato's corpus, it must be wrong or fictional. In this thesis, I will not use Plato's dialogues as an absolute standard to judge the reliability of the image of Socrates Xenophon creates in his corpus arbitrarily. However, in quite a lot of specific detail, similar accounts in Plato's early works

a. Focus on Ethical Subjects

Sed ab antiqua philosophia usque ad Socratem, qui Archelaum, Anaxagorae discipulum, audierat, numeri motusque tractabantur, et unde omnia orerentur quoque reciderent, studioseque ab is siderum magnitudines interualla cursus anquirebantur et cuncta caelestia. Socrates autem primus philosophiam deuocauit e caelo et in urbibus conlocauit et in domus etiam introduxit et coëgit de uita et moribus rebusque bonis et malis quaerere.

But from the ancient days down to the time of Socrates, who had listened to Archelaus the pupil of Anaxagoras, philosophy dealt with numbers and movements, with the problem whence all things came, or whither they returned, and zealously inquired into the size of the stars, the spaces that divided them, their courses and all celestial phenomena; Socrates on the other hand was the first to call philosophy down from the heaven; and set her in the cities of men and bring her also into their homes and compel her to ask questions about life and morality and things good and evil. (Cic. *Tusc.* 5.4.10)

The passage of Cicero cited above points out one of the most important contributions of Socrates to ancient Greek philosophy: he managed to divert philosophers' attention from physical and astronomical phenomena to social morality and human life. Cicero's comment is justified by Plato and Aristotle's account. In Plato's *Phaedo*, Socrates claims that he failed in the study of material things, especially the teaching of Anaxagoras, and therefore turned to the domain of ethics (Pl. *Phd.* 96e-100a). In the *Metaphysics* Aristotle reports for us that 'Socrates was busy himself about ethical matters and neglecting the world of nature as a whole but seeking the universal in these ethical matters' (Arist. *Metaph.* 987b1-3). He also

will be cited as external evidence to support Xenophon's narrative and to show the possibility how Socrates' thought and behaviour can influence Xenophon.

claims that in the time of Socrates philosophers' attention was diverted from nature to 'political science' and 'virtues which benefit mankind' (Arist. *Part. an.* 642a28-31). In this aspect in particular, it seems Xenophon fully understood and approved of Socrates' doctrine. He tells us in the *Memorabilia* that Socrates questioned the value of studies on 'heavenly phenomena' (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.15), and decided to study the issues listed below instead:

αὐτὸς δὲ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπείων ἀεὶ διελέγετο σκοπῶν τί εὐσεβές, τί ἀσεβές, τί καλόν, τί αἰσχρόν, τί δίκαιον, τί ἄδικον, τί σωφροσύνη, τί μανία, τί ἀνδρεία, τί δειλία, τί πόλις, τί πολιτικός, τί ἀρχὴ ἀνθρώπων, τί ἀρχικὸς ἀνθρώπων, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἃ τοὺς μὲν εἰδότας ἡγεῖτο καλοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι, τοὺς δ' ἀγνοοῦντας ἀνδραποδώδεις ἂν δικαίως κεκλήσθαι.

His [Socrates'] own conversation was ever of human things. The problems he discussed were, what is pious, what is impious; what is beautiful, what is ugly; what is just, what is unjust; what is moderation, what is madness; what is courage, what is cowardice; what is a polis, what is a statesman; what is government, and is a governor; — these and others like them, of which the knowledge made a 'good and brave man', in his estimation, while ignorance should involve justly the reproach of 'slavishness'. (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.15)

Besides testimonies offered by Cicero, Plato and Aristotle, Xenophon's observation is also supported by later works of Seneca the Younger, Sextus Empiricus, Aulus Gellius and Diogenes Laertius.¹⁴¹ Therefore, there is no good reason to doubt that Xenophon's interest on moral issues was to some extent inspired by Socrates. In that sense, Xenophon proves that he deserves to be called a follower of Socrates. He clearly realised that human morality was the object of his teacher's study; and he tried to achieve the same goal by putting forward creative advice on systematic social education of morality in his own way. His method of study is more political, historical and less philosophical; yet his final aim is identical to that of

¹⁴¹ Bandini and Dorion (2000), 63.

Socrates. As my later chapters will show, his *Cyropaedia*, *Spartan Constitution*, *Hiero*, *Poroi*, *Agésilas* and *Oeconomicus* are all highly relative to moral and ethical subjects. Therefore it is quite safe to conclude that it is Socrates' philosophical teaching that directs Xenophon to turn his attention to the study of moral issues.

A second possible impact of Socratic ethics on Xenophon was indirect and was put to effect through his frequent citations from ancient Greek poetry (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.56) in his daily conversation. In his extant corpus, Xenophon seldom mentions names and works of Greek poets; the only exceptions are two of his works on Socrates (the *Symposium* and the *Memorabilia*) and one dialogue in the 'Socratic style' (the *Hiero*) similar to Plato's works. In the former two writings, Homer's name is mentioned repeatedly (Xen. *Symp.* 3.5, 4.6, 4.45; Xen. *Mem.* 2.6.11); other poets Xenophon mentioned include Hesiod (Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.20), Theognis (Xen. *Symp.* 2.4) and Simonides.¹⁴² In my opinion, this uneven distribution of citation from poets is by no means casual. As a soldier and military historian, Xenophon never shows in his other extant writings that he has a strong interest and an elegant taste in poetry like Plato and Aristotle. It is very likely that he got most of his knowledge on poetry through Socrates' conversations. He tells us that some members in Socrates' circle, for example Niceratus (Xen. *Symp.* 3.5), are expert in Homer's works, and one subject they discussed is kingship described in the *Iliad* (Xen. *Symp.* 4.6). It seems that Socrates and his friends were following the traditional Greek custom of exchanging verses during a symposium.¹⁴³ In Plato's *Republic*, though Socrates' opinion on poets is overall negative (Pl. *Resp.* 377a-396e), he still follows the same tradition of drawing analogy from ancient poetry (Pl. *Resp.* 383b; 546e-547a). This practice may have an influence on Xenophon's understanding of his own role correspondent to an adviser on moral issues.

What is more, serving as an adviser to kings and heroes was one traditional role

¹⁴² Xen. *Hier.* 1.1. The influence of Socrates to Xenophon in this aspect is quite convincing, as all these poets mentioned here also appear in Plato's Socratic dialogues.

¹⁴³ Bowen (1998), 95.

of ancient Greek poets ever since the age of Hesiod.¹⁴⁴ In the opening part of the *Theogony*, Hesiod confirms his own role as an advisor to kings (Hes. *Theog.* 81-92) and claims that the Muses know both how to tell a lie which looks like truth and how to tell truth if they wish (Hes. *Theog.* 26-28). In Xenophon's age, Plato began to criticise poets, as they were only popular for their ability in imitation, not for their wisdom (Pl. *Resp.* 392b). But according to Xenophon's uncritical understanding of poetry and philosophy, he must have believed that the role of poets, which Socrates frequently mentioned in his conversations, is correspondent to that of Socrates himself and therefore respectable. In his *Memorabilia* Socrates once advised a general as follows:

For what reason, think you, is Agamemnon dubbed 'shepherd of the people' by Homer? Is it because a shepherd must see that his sheep are safe and are fed, and that the object for which they are kept is attained, and a general must see that his men are safe and are fed, and that the object for which they fight is attained, or, in other words, that victory over the enemy may add to their happiness? Or what reason can he have for praising Agamemnon as 'both a good king and a doughty warrior too'? Is it that he would be 'a doughty warrior too' not if he alone were a good fighter, but if he made all his men like himself; and 'a good king' not if he merely ordered his own life aright, but if he made his subjects happy as well? (Xen. *Mem.* 3.2.1-4)

Two points in this passage are noteworthy. First, the verses of ancient poets and their analogical way of expression are cited and adopted here as philosophical evidence; and Socrates' task is simply to clarify the meaning of Homer and to explain the correspondence between domestic and political affairs exhaustively. This tradition and rhetorical skill seem to be borrowed by Xenophon in his queen bee metaphor (Xen. *Oec.* 7.17-34) in the *Oeconomicus*, as Part 3, Chapter 2 of this thesis will show. Second, Socrates and Xenophon believe that the content of the verses cited offers

¹⁴⁴ Rosati (2009), 369-374; Pucci (2007), 106-107.

advice to kings and generals on their proper behaviour. This is also a common feature in the works of later poets, such as Pindar, Simonides and Bacchylides.¹⁴⁵ In Xenophon's eyes, to give moral advice on political leaders to regulate their behaviour is the task of ancient poets and Socrates, and is also what he should do in his prose works. In the *Hiero*, Xenophon chooses to give moral admonition to a tyrant through the mouth of Simonides, a famous lyric poet of the previous generation. It is quite possible that this choice is not arbitrary, but reflects Xenophon's recognition of his own role as a moral advisor under the influence of Socrates' discourse on poetry.

In sum, Socrates' ethical philosophy greatly influenced Xenophon's idea on moral education. First, Socrates' teaching directed his interest to moral issues and encouraged him to focus his attention on human virtues and the relationship between individual and society in his mature works, for example the *Cyropaedia*.¹⁴⁶ Second, Socrates' teaching method (citing poems for philosophical purposes) allowed Xenophon to gain a basic understanding of the tradition of Greek poetry, and helped him confirm his own role as a moral advisor for monarchs and generals like his Simonides in the *Hiero*.

b. Attention to Art of Leadership in Public Life

Generally speaking, Xenophon's Socrates talks more about leadership than Plato's Socrates does. Carol McNamara suggests that Xenophon intends to show to his readers that Socrates is a beneficial teacher of politics¹⁴⁷ who pays close attention to Athenian politics all his life.¹⁴⁸ Though this conjecture, in my opinion, cannot be fully attested yet,¹⁴⁹ the interest in political leadership of Xenophon's Socrates in the *Memorabilia* (especially his Book 3) is quite evident. Some of his arguments show

¹⁴⁵ For detailed discussion on the political imagery of shepherd, cf. Brock (2013), 43-52.

¹⁴⁶ Luccioni (1953), 148.

¹⁴⁷ McNamara (2009), 242.

¹⁴⁸ McNamara (2009), 223.

¹⁴⁹ One problem is that Xenophon's own feeling to Athenian democracy is complex and sometimes very negative. See Xen. *Hell.* 1.7.34-35.

similarity to Xenophon's own opinions in his other works on social education carried out by political leaders and indicate signs of inheritance of ideas. For instance, Xenophon's Socrates answered Aristippus' question on the burden of competent leaders (Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.17) by explaining to him that voluntary sufferings actually lead to ultimate happiness, (Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.18-20) just as Simonides argues in Xenophon's *Hiero*. In comparison to the image Plato establishes,¹⁵⁰ Xenophon's Socrates paid more attention to the economic prosperity of Athens¹⁵¹ and told Glaucon that an able leader must always keep an eye on the city's revenue (Xen. *Mem.* 3.6.5-6) and food supply (Xen. *Mem.* 3.6.13-14), which reminds us of Xenophon's *Poroi* and the latter's emphasis on the economic foundation of his system of moral education. In the *Memorabilia* Socrates also expressed the idea that the laziness of servants is chiefly due to the fault of the master (Xen. *Mem.* 3.13.4), which is similar to Xenophon's view in the *Oeconomicus*, an atypical 'Socratic writing' mainly reflecting Xenophon's own doctrine instead of that of Socrates. Furthermore, in the Xen. *Mem.* 3.6.4-6, Socrates also suggests that competent Athenian leaders must make great efforts to increase the revenue of the state;¹⁵² that idea is also expressed by Xenophon in his *Poroi* which is to be discussed in later chapters.¹⁵³ And in Plato's corpus, we can also find out that Socrates is a brave critic of Athenian politics (Pl. *Ap.* 30d-31c) and a keen observer of all types of existing political leadership (Pl. *Resp.* 497a ff; *Plt.* 259b). But on the whole, we must admit that the content of Socrates' teaching on leadership is quite different and far less systematic than Xenophon's own theory of the same subject expressed in the *Cyropaedia* or the *Agesilaus*. This is not surprising, for Xenophon is actually an original thinker¹⁵⁴ who is able to develop his own theory from all kinds of literature

¹⁵⁰ For instance, Pl. *Euthyd.* 280b-281a touches but does not treat seriously the economic issues compared to Xenophon's *Poroi*, which, in my opinion, reveals Plato and Xenophon's different interests and the different heritage they inherit from Socrates.

¹⁵¹ Bandini and Dorion (2011a), 312.

¹⁵² Liddel (2007), 255.

¹⁵³ See Part 2, Chapter 4 of this thesis.

¹⁵⁴ Waterfield (2004), 79.

traditions and his life experience, as we shall see in Part 2 and 3 of this dissertation. In spite of that, I believe that two features of Socrates' thought on leadership still had an influence on Xenophon's later doctrine on social education of morality.¹⁵⁵

First of all, Socrates confirmed that government is an art for kings and generals; this idea encouraged Xenophon to take competent leadership as an indispensable element of his social education. In the context of Plato's Socrates, an ideal political leader must be a philosopher as well (Pl. *Resp.* 487e-489c). Xenophon's Socrates says that kings and rulers are 'not those who hold the sceptre, nor those chosen by lot, nor those who are assigned by the multitude, nor those who owe their power to force, or by deception; but those who know how to rule' (Xen. *Mem.* 3.9.10). In other words, true political leaders are those who master the art of government. He advised Dionysodorus to learn this art well before taking part in politics (Xen. *Mem.* 3.1.1-2), and patiently pointed out to him that generalship is not simply equal to tactics, but includes many higher requirements (Xen. *Mem.* 3.1.6). If a political leader does master these skills, everyone will be willing to turn to him for help in politics (Xen. *Mem.* 2.6.26), for 'under all conditions human beings are most willing to obey those whom they believe to be the best' (Xen. *Mem.* 3.3.9). On the other hand, if the leader ignores them, he will always be punished when he makes mistakes (Xen. *Mem.* 3.9.12-13).

In the second place, in Socrates' doctrine, political leadership becomes something relevant to social morality.¹⁵⁶ In Plato's *Republic*, Socrates criticises that one of the most serious shortcomings of oligarchy and democracy is that they fail to maintain and improve social morality (Pl. *Resp.* 551a, 558c). Xenophon also states:

Kingship and despotism, in his [Socrates'] judgment, were both forms of

¹⁵⁵ Because the dates of Xenophon's three (or four, counting the *Oeconomicus*) Socratic writings cannot be firmly established, we have no means to exclude the possibility that Xenophon sometimes describes Socrates according to his own discipline in some aspects. Nevertheless, as Xenophon became Socrates' friend in his youth, his main role in their relationship must be mainly a receiver; and the general accordance of it with Plato's relevant depiction and the difference between it and typical fictional images appearing in Xenophon's works give us no sufficient reason to question the reliability of Xenophon's narrative.

¹⁵⁶ Tamiolaki (2012), 583.

government, but he held that they differed. For government of men with their consent and in accordance with the laws of the state was kingship; while government of unwilling subjects and not controlled by laws, but imposed by the will of the ruler, was despotism. (Xen. *Mem.* 4.6.12)

In that context, the nature of political leadership obtains a moral sense. Whether it is lawful is determined by how the leader governs and the reaction of his subjects. Kingship is virtuous as it satisfies people's needs and leads them to happiness; while despotism which fails to satisfy its subjects must be evil in nature and should be overthrown. Therefore, the teacher of kingship should not only be an expert in military, diplomatic and economic affairs, but also become a moral philosopher like Socrates or Xenophon. Following that logic, Xenophon's Socrates claimed to Antiphon that he actually played a very important part in politics by taking pains to turn out as many competent politicians as possible (Xen. *Mem.* 1.6.15), which is exactly the greatest contribution a moral philosopher could do for the society he lives in.¹⁵⁷ In his opinion, the basis of beneficial generalship is selflessness¹⁵⁸ and concern of public welfare.¹⁵⁹ These ideas, though not being identical to Xenophon's own doctrine of social education on morality devised later, must have impressed him and encouraged him to think and study leadership from the standpoint of a moral teacher, and put forward and explain his own idea on the same subject in his *Cyropaedia*, *Oeconomicus* and other works.¹⁶⁰

In short, Socrates' ideas on leadership offer certain arguments for Xenophon's system of social education. As we will see below, some of these features can also be attested by Plato's early works. Socrates' discourses emphasise the importance of the art of government and connect it to social morality, and inspired Xenophon's own

¹⁵⁷ Of course, as Socrates' enemies accused (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.12), Socrates failed to educate some notorious Athenian politicians, for example Critias and Alcibiades, well. Nevertheless, at least in Xenophon's opinion, this is due to the fact that these people did not really follow Socrates' doctrines but only want to make use of him (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.13-16).

¹⁵⁸ Lorch (2010), 195.

¹⁵⁹ Lorch (2010), 210-211.

¹⁶⁰ Delatte (1933), 49.

thought on the same topic.

II. Apologetic Nature of Xenophon's Socratic Writings and Beyond

For the purpose of this thesis, if we confine our study to the two topics on the importance of moral subjects and leadership Socrates discussed in the passages of the *Symposium* and the *Memorabilia* cited above, I see no reason to question Xenophon's narrative that Socrates is interested in ethics and leadership, because this can be attested by external evidence from Plato (Pl. *Phd.* 96e-100a; *Resp.* 473c-e), Aristotle (Arist. *Metaph.* 987b1-3; *Part. An.* 642a28-31) and Cicero (Cic. *Tusc.* 5.4.10) well.¹⁶¹ What is more, Socrates' method of discussing morality by citing poems and many of his arguments on leadership are generally different from Xenophon's shown in the latter's other extant writings; therefore, it is not quite plausible to suppose that Xenophon actually made up these discourses. Of course, due to his incorrect memory and poor understanding of philosophy, Xenophon's interpretation of Socrates' doctrine may contain some mistakes; but on the whole it is certain that Socrates did discuss moral issues and questions on leadership in his daily life, as Xenophon, Plato¹⁶² and other classical writers reported for us.¹⁶³ Nevertheless, in another two points, namely Socrates' piety and his character as a perfect educator on morality, I believe that Xenophon's report must be exaggerated and rhetorical. This is due to the apologetic nature of his Socratic writings, which also had a great influence on his other works on the image of the perfect educator in social morality.

As a matter of fact, most extant works treating Socrates' life and his trial are

¹⁶¹ Simeterre (1938), 16.

¹⁶² In Plato's early Socratic works, the *Charmides* is on temperance; the *Lysis* is on friendship; the *Laches* is on courage; the *Symposium* is on love and many other moral topics; in all these works his Socrates chiefly treats ethical issues. And Plato's *Res Publica*, his masterpiece on politics, contains rich ideas on the management and development of all types of leadership (Pl. *Resp.* 544c-592b). Though the Socratic question remains unsolved, the general image of Socrates Plato depicts must be partly historical and offers supportive evidence on the possible impact of Socratic doctrine on Xenophon's version of moral education carried out by ideal leadership.

¹⁶³ Anderson (1974), 20.

essentially apologetic.¹⁶⁴ Plato's *Apology*, *Crito*, *Euthyphro*, *First Alcibiades* as well as some other dialogues are apologetic in nature;¹⁶⁵ and Xenophon's *Symposium*, *Apology* and *Memorabilia* are not exceptional either.¹⁶⁶ These apologetic works serve as a response to the sentence of Socrates to death by the Athenian jury¹⁶⁷ and other charges against him, for example Aristophanes' *Clouds* and Polycrates' 'Accusation of Socrates'.¹⁶⁸ The charges against Socrates focused on two points. First, people believed that Socrates was impious (Pl. *Ap.* 18b-c; Ar. *Nub.* 226-234, 247-248, 367); second, they accused him of corrupting other people (especially youths) by his absurd and immoral doctrines (Pl. *Ap.* 23c; Ar. *Nub.* 816-817, 1476-1477). Although Xenophon did not embellish the image of Socrates in his works as much as Plato did,¹⁶⁹ the apologetic sense in defence of the two charges is still evident in his Socratic writings.¹⁷⁰ In the *Apology*, Xenophon is well aware that Socrates was convicted for 'not believing in the gods worshipped by the state' (Xen. *Ap.* 11) and 'corrupting the youth' (Xen. *Ap.* 25). Again, in the *Memorabilia*, he mentions the conviction of Socrates for his 'rejecting the gods acknowledged by the state and bringing in strange deities' and 'corrupting the youth' (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.1). He states further in detail that his accuser denounced that Socrates despised the established laws (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.9-11), associated with evil politicians such as Critias and Alcibiades (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.12), and caused his companions to dishonour their fathers and other relatives or friends (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.51-52). It is easy to see that the two charges are the central topics in the opening parts of Xenophon's *Apology* and *Memorabilia*,¹⁷¹ and the remaining parts of the two works serve as defence against the two invalid accusations. In a third Socratic work of Xenophon, the *Symposium*, Philippus also questioned Socrates' impiety (Xen. *Symp.* 6.7) and his

¹⁶⁴ Brickhouse and Smith (1989), 2-10; Bowen (1998), 7.

¹⁶⁵ Brickhouse and Smith (1989), 6-7; Bandini and Dorion (2000), 66-67.

¹⁶⁶ Bandini and Dorion (2000), 65.

¹⁶⁷ Gray (1989b), 136.

¹⁶⁸ Marchant (1923), ix.

¹⁶⁹ Bandini and Dorion (2000), 69.

¹⁷⁰ Bandini and Dorion (2000), 93-94.

¹⁷¹ Simeterre (1938), 7.

problematic philosophical doctrines, and was refuted by Socrates wisely and politely (Xen. *Symp.* 6.8-10). In sum, the refutation of false charges against Socrates dominates Xenophon's Socratic works. His intention of recalling Socrates' life and his teachings is to re-establish a positive image of his teacher for contemporary Greeks. He was eager to show his readers that, instead of the negative image created by Meletus and other accusers, Socrates was actually an extremely pious man and moral teacher helpful to everyone around him. Through his apologetic description, Socrates became a pious worshipper and an ideal educator in virtue, and therefore served as a prototype of other educators Xenophon describes in his works on public moral education.

In fact, the impact of the apologetic colour is not confined to Xenophon's Socratic works, but also influences the composition of his other writings. As W.E. Higgins observes, 'in everything he [Xenophon] wrote, ... the mark of Socrates can be seen'.¹⁷² As a pupil and admirer of Socrates, Xenophon would seldom lose any opportunity to show his readers that his teacher was a pious and virtuous man; and he, as a follower of Socrates, always commits himself to the study of virtue and morality. Modern scholars have already noticed that the piety of Cyrus the Great depicted in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* is almost identical to that of Socrates in the *Memorabilia*,¹⁷³ even the condemnation of the latter reappears in the dialogue between Cyrus and Tigranes (Xen. *Cyr.* 3.1.38). And the voluntary labours discussed in the *Cyropaedia* (Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.80) and the *Hiero* (Xen. *Hier.* 11.1-15) are developed from Socrates' idea expressed in the *Memorabilia*, 2.1.18.¹⁷⁴ Even in his historical works, Xenophon also frequently grasps certain opportunities to defend Socrates' and his own deeds.¹⁷⁵ The following passage from the *Anabasis* is quite representative:

After reading the letter [of Proxenus] Xenophon conferred with Socrates, the Athenian, about the proposed journey; and Socrates, suspecting that his

¹⁷² Higgins (1973), 21.

¹⁷³ Bandini and Dorion (2000), 50.

¹⁷⁴ Bandini and Dorion (2011a), 146.

¹⁷⁵ Luccioni (1953), 129.

becoming a friend of Cyrus might be a cause for accusation against Xenophon on the part of the Athenian government, for the reason that Cyrus was thought to have given the Lacedaemonians zealous aid in their war against Athens, advised Xenophon to go to Delphi and consult the god in regard to this journey. So Xenophon went and asked Apollo to what one of the gods he should sacrifice and pray in order best and most successfully to perform the journey which he had in mind and, after meeting with good fortune, to return home in safety; and Apollo in his response told him to what gods he must sacrifice. When Xenophon came back from Delphi, he reported the oracle to Socrates; and upon hearing about it Socrates found fault with him because he did not first put the question whether it were better for him to go or stay, but decided for himself that he was to go and then asked the god as to the best way of going. ‘However,’ he added, ‘since you did put the question in that way, you must do all that the god directed.’ (Xen. *An.* 3.1.5-7)

Although this passage is nothing but a short episode, and Socrates only appears in the *Anabasis* as a minor figure, the apologetic elements are still fully incorporated here. First, Xenophon wished his readers to believe that both Socrates and Xenophon himself, the teacher and the pupil, are extremely pious men and respect Apollo and his oracles, as well as other traditional gods properly. Second, Socrates was a virtuous and wise man, who was always ready to offer help and good advice to youths like Xenophon. Only with the background of Socrates’ trial kept in mind can we fully understand the intention of Xenophon’s composition. Xenophon even made an apology of Socratic philosophy¹⁷⁶ indirectly in his manual on hunting:

Many others besides me blame the sophists of our generation — philosophers I will not call them — because the wisdom they profess consists of words and not of thoughts. I am well aware that someone, perhaps one of this set, will say that what is well and methodically written is not well and methodically written—for

¹⁷⁶ L’Allier (2012), 486.

hasty and false censure will come easily to them. But my aim in writing has been to produce sound work that will make men not sophistical, but wise and good (καίτοι γέγραπται γε οὕτως, ἵνα ὀρθῶς ἔχη, καὶ μὴ σοφιστικοὺς ποιῇ ἀλλὰ σοφοὺς καὶ ἀγαθοὺς). For I wish my work not to seem useful, but to be so, that it may stand for all time unrefuted. The sophists talk to deceive and write for their own gain, and do no good to anyone. For there is not, and there never was, a wise man among them; each of them is content to be called a sophist, which is a term of reproach among sensible men. So my advice is: Avoid the behests of the sophists, and despise not the conclusions of the philosophers; for the sophists hunt the rich and young, but the philosophers are friends to all alike: but as for men's fortunes, they neither honour nor despise them. (Xen. *Cyn.* 13.6-9)

According to Socrates' accusers, the impious Socrates who corrupted the youth was a typical sophist. But it is clear that Xenophon is rejecting the charges here.¹⁷⁷ He hints to us that the school of Socrates has nothing in common with sophists, just as Socrates' claim in the *Memorabilia* shows (Xen. *Mem.* 1.6.13-14); and as a loyal follower of Socrates, his work is meant to make its readers 'wise and good (σοφός καὶ ἀγαθός)'. In that case, the very need to defend Socrates' reputation also encourages Xenophon to focus his study of moral education and make his research findings known all around the Greek world. He, as well as his teacher Socrates, is always a seeker of truth and virtue and the enemy of sophists and all kinds of evil doctrines. Their goal is to benefit the Greek people and pursue goodness and happiness for them through their research on human society.

Xenophon's need to make apology for Socrates in defence of the accusations against him produced a perfect image of an educator in morality in his Socratic writings. It is hard to know the date of composition of these works; but I believe the image of Socrates they describe must have already been borne in Xenophon's mind when he studied with Socrates and reflected upon his trial shortly after learning the

¹⁷⁷ L'Allier (2012), 488.

news of his death. Therefore, it is safe to conclude that the idealised character of Socrates was shaped prior to other heroes in Xenophon's works composed in his old age; and this character may to some extent help to shape the idealised images in Xenophon's other extant works, for example Cyrus the Great (the *Cyropaedia*), Agesilaus (the *Agesilaus* and the *Hellenica*), Lycurgus (the *Spartan Constitution*), Simonides (the *Hiero*) and competent Athenian administrative officers (the *Poroi*),¹⁷⁸ in the sense that they are all pious, lawful heroes who are beneficial to others. Naturally, the first and most prominent feature of this figure is incomparable piety.¹⁷⁹ Xenophon's Socrates offers sacrifices constantly (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.2-3); he believes that gods are beneficial to mankind and are all-knowing (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.18); he always obeys traditional religious customs (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.1); he respects the authority of the priestess at Delphi (Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.1; Xen. *An.* 3.1.5-7); he teaches his students that gods take care of both man's body (Xen. *Mem.* 1.4.11-12) and his soul (Xen. *Mem.* 1.4.13-14), and all wise and enduring human institutions, cities and nations are god-fearing and religious (Xen. *Mem.* 1.4.16); he suggests that the best way to show thanks to the gods is to obey their will in daily life (Xen. *Mem.* 4.3.15-17). In sum, piety is the first and foremost virtue for Xenophon's Socrates and all his other virtues are subordinate to his religious belief.

At the same time, in Xenophon's mind, Socrates' piety is not simply that of an ordinary god-fearing man. It is divine and somewhat supernatural in itself. A distinctive feature of Xenophon's *Apology* is that it claims that Socrates foresaw his death and chose it willingly according to the gods' arrangement (Xen. *Ap.* 1). He believed that, for his old age, death is more desired than life (Xen. *Ap.* 5); he understood well that gods wanted him to die (Xen. *Ap.* 7) and bestowed death on him as an extraordinary gift (Xen. *Ap.* 8-9). These acts and teachings are very similar to the supernatural behaviour of Cyrus the Great before he passed away (Xen. *Cyr.*

¹⁷⁸ Tamiolaki (2012), 580.

¹⁷⁹ Bandini and Dorion (2011b), 227.

8.7.1-28). Xenophon's Socrates can often hear the voice of God indicating his duty in his head (Xen. *Ap.* 12-13); and he claimed that Apollo judged that he, like Lycurgus (as well as the image of Lycurgus in Xenophon's *Spartan Constitution*, see Xen. *Lac.* 15.9), far excelled the rest of mankind (Xen. *Ap.* 15). In that sense, the piety Xenophon attributes to Socrates is quite unusual and even mysterious. It bestows on Socrates (and a few other pious heroes in Xenophon's later works, for example Cyrus the Great and Lycurgus of Sparta) charisma, ability to foresee the future, and unparalleled and divine wisdom. This supernatural character reappeared in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, *Spartan Constitution* and *Agesilaus*, as we shall see in later chapters.

A second product of Xenophon's apologetic description is the character of Socrates as a great educator on morality. Generally, Xenophon's description of Socrates' moral character fits the conception of καλὸς κἀγαθός (Xen. *Symp.* 1.1), a traditional title used by aristocrats of Athens in the fifth century B.C.¹⁸⁰ In Plato's Socratic dialogues, the position of this term is marginal;¹⁸¹ but it plays a central role in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*.¹⁸² In Plato's extant works, this term only appears for about sixty times; but it appears for about eighty times in the corpus of Xenophon, which contains far fewer words in comparison to that of Plato.¹⁸³ Among these about eighty uses, thirty-three of them show up in Xenophon's Socratic writings (six times in the *Symposium* and twenty-seven in the *Memorabilia*).¹⁸⁴ In Xenophon's works, Socrates' education is primarily done by his own moral example.¹⁸⁵ In the *Memorabilia*, Xenophon refutes the accusation on Socrates' corruption of the youth by a thoroughgoing listing and defence of his virtues.¹⁸⁶ Apart from piety to the gods,

¹⁸⁰ Roscalla (2004), 115. It is quite noteworthy that the title 'καλὸς κἀγαθός' is frequently used to describe both Socrates and his friends (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.16, 1.2.2; Xen. *Symp.* 1.1) and other good leaders and citizens in Xenophon's corpus (Xen. *Hier.* 10.2-4; Xen. *Oec.* 3.11-12, 10.1; Xen. *Lac.* 7 (see Bordes (1982), 179)), which seems to suggest close connection between Socrates and ideal social education in Xenophon's context.

¹⁸¹ Roscalla (2004), 117.

¹⁸² Roscalla (2004), 119.

¹⁸³ Bourriot (1995), 287.

¹⁸⁴ Bourriot (1995), 295.

¹⁸⁵ Morrison (2010), 222-223.

¹⁸⁶ Morrison (2010), 195.

the most important element ascribed to Socrates in Xenophon's *Memorabilia* is justice (δικαιοσύνη), which is also a key theme in his most important work on moral education, the *Cyropaedia*.¹⁸⁷ It is because other characteristics, such as bravery and intelligence, can be both positive and negative; but justice 'can have no part in injustice at all' (Xen. *Symp.* 3.4 ; c.f. Pl. *Prt.* 331a-b.) in Xenophon's understanding of Socratic teaching. According to Xenophon, when Socrates was on the council of Athens, he refused to support the motion to convict Thrasyllus, Erasinides and their colleagues 'in spite of popular rancour and the threats of many powerful persons' because it was illegal and unjust (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.18). Xenophon summarises in the fourth book of his *Memorabilia*:

Ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ περὶ τοῦ δικαίου γε οὐκ ἀπεκρύπτετο ἦν εἶχε γνώμην, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔργῳ ἀπεδείκνυτο, ἰδίᾳ τε πᾶσι νομίμως τε καὶ ὠφελίμως χρώμενος καὶ κοινῇ ἄρχουσί τε ἃ οἱ νόμοι προστάττειεν πειθόμενος καὶ κατὰ πόλιν καὶ ἐν ταῖς στρατείαις οὕτως ὥστε διάδηλος εἶναι παρὰ τοὺς ἄλλους εὐτακτῶν.

Again, concerning justice he [Socrates] did not hide his opinion, but proclaimed it by his actions. All his private conduct was lawful and helpful: to public authority he rendered such scrupulous obedience in all that the laws required, both in civil life and in military service, that he was a pattern of good discipline to all. (Xen. *Mem.* 4.4.1)

Another important virtue, which befits a moral philosopher like Socrates in particular, is self-control (σωφροσύνη). Xenophon reports for us that Socrates was the strictest of men in control of his own passions and appetites and always followed the golden rule of moderation (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.1); he disapproved of over-eating (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.4) and only allowed a due portion of pleasure for himself in enjoyments such as eating, drinking and sexual desire (Xen. *Mem.* 1.3.14). He also kept in subjection the pleasure money brings (Xen. *Mem.* 1.5.6 ; c.f. Pl. *Chrm.* 159a-161b.).

In sum, in Xenophon's mind, Socrates' moral character is perfect and almost

¹⁸⁷ Danzig (2009), 294.

sacred. He is not only a virtuous man, but also worthy of being worshipped like the gods.¹⁸⁸ Such an excellent example cannot corrupt the youth, as his enemies slandered. On the contrary, everyone should seek for friendship with virtuous men like Socrates (Xen. *Symp.* 2.4), because, as Theognis says, ‘good men will teach you good; the bad will even destroy the sense you had’ (Thgn. 35.1). In response to Socrates’ accusers, Xenophon firmly insists that the school of Socrates values greatly the moral education of the youth, as he claims:

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τοὺς εὐφροενεστάτους, ἐρρωμενεστάτους τε ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὄντας καὶ ἐξεργαστικωτάτους ὧν ἂν ἐγχειρῶσι, παιδευθέντας μὲν καὶ μαθόντας ἃ δεῖ πράττειν, ἀρίστους τε καὶ ὠφελιμωτάτους γίνεσθαι · πλεῖστα γὰρ καὶ μέγιστα ἀγαθὰ ἐργάζεσθαι · ἀπαιδεύτους δὲ καὶ ἀμαθεῖς γενομένους κακίστους τε καὶ βλαβερωτάτους γίνεσθαι · κρίνειν γὰρ οὐκ ἐπισταμένους ἃ δεῖ πράττειν, πολλάκις πονηροῖς ἐπιχειρεῖν πράγμασι, μεγαλείους δὲ καὶ σφοδροὺς ὄντας δυσκαθέκτους τε καὶ δυσαποτρέπτους εἶναι, δι’ ὃ πλεῖστα καὶ μέγιστα κακὰ ἐργάζεσθαι.

The most highly gifted, the youths of ardent soul, capable of doing whatever they attempt, if educated and taught their duty, will grow into excellent and useful men; for their good deeds are manifold and great. But untrained and untaught, these same would become utterly evil and mischievous; for without knowledge to discern their duty, they often put their hand to vile deeds; and through the very grandeur and vehemence of their nature, they are uncontrollable and intractable: therefore manifold and great are their evil deeds.

(Xen. *Mem.* 4.1.4.)

Therefore, virtuous men like Socrates are extremely useful for youths and anyone around them (Xen. *Mem.* 4.1.1). Xenophon benefited greatly from his contact with Socrates, so that it is beyond his power to forget him or refrain from praising him constantly (Xen. *Ap.* 34). He also stresses, evidently much more than Plato, the

¹⁸⁸ Pangle (1985), 108.

influence of Socrates' moral character on other people.¹⁸⁹ Although Plato's Socrates denies being anyone's teacher and sometimes questions sophists whether virtues can be taught at all, Xenophon's Socrates appears as an expert teacher on morality.¹⁹⁰ Because of his supernatural gift to foresee the future, many of his companions asked him for advice; and those who rejected his suggestions regretted it later (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.4). What is more, Socrates is always accessible and always ready to help others, as he lived ever in the open and went to public promenades and training-grounds as well as the market-place (ἀγορά) to talk with people every day (Xen. *Mem.* 1.1.10). By doing this he 'cured vices in many, by putting into them a desire for goodness, and by giving them confidence that self-discipline would make them good and honourable men (καλοὶ καγαθοί)' (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.2). On the one hand, Socrates never openly professed to be a teacher of morality; but on the other hand, 'by letting his own light shine, he led his disciples to hope that they would attain to such excellence through imitation of him' (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.2-3). At the very end of his *Memorabilia*, Xenophon concludes Socrates' glorious image as a great educator in morality:

All who knew what manner of man Socrates was and who seek after virtue (ἀρετή) continue to this day to miss him beyond all others, as the chief of helpers in the quest of virtue. For myself, I have described him as he was: so pious (εὐσεβής) that he did nothing without counsel from the gods; so just (δίκαιος) that he did no injury, however small, to any man; so useful (ὠφελεῖν) to bring the greatest benefits on all who dealt with him; so self-controlled (ἐγκρατής) that he never chose the pleasanter rather than the better course; so wise (φρονίμος) that he was unerring in his judgment of the better and the worse, and needed no counsellor, but relied on himself for his knowledge of them; masterly in expounding and defining such things; no less masterly in

¹⁸⁹ Morrison (2010), 226.

¹⁹⁰ Dorion (2009), 95.

putting others to the test, and convincing them of error and exhorting them to follow virtue and gentleness (καλοκαγαθία). To me then he seemed to be all that a truly good and happy man must be. But if there is any doubter, let him set the character of other men beside these things; then let him judge. (Xen. *Mem.* 4.8.11)

In conclusion, the influence of Socrates on Xenophon's system of social education chiefly lay in two aspects. In the first place, Socrates' study and teaching on human nature and leadership attracted Xenophon's attention to social education in morality carried out by competent political leaders; and certain of Socrates' arguments and methods were borrowed by Xenophon in his later works on moral education. In the second place, Socrates' death and the accusations against him induced Xenophon to make apology for his teacher and hero in his Socratic writings as well as other works, so that he created a perfect image of the moral educator featured in his unparalleled piety and his positive influence on other people through his own virtuous moral example, which serves as a prototype of the heroes in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, *Spartan Constitution*, *Agesilaus*, *Oeconomicus*, and *Hiero*.

Part 2: A Systematic Theory of Moral Education from a Social Perspective

In this part, I shall deal with the core content of Xenophon's thought on moral education. Chapter 1 treats the *Cyropaedia*, which is the most systematic work of Xenophon on that subject in my opinion; and I will compare it with Xenophon's writing on πολιτεία, namely the *Spartan Constitution*, to show the former's political nature. Nevertheless, Xenophon must have realised that such a highly idealised model is hard to put into practice if competent leaders either refuse to undertake such a rewardless task or fail to secure their own political power before carrying out moral education for his people. Therefore, Xenophon tries to resolve these two difficulties by rhetorical persuasion and making allowance for dark policies in his works. Chapter 2 analyses Xenophon's *Hiero* and its role to persuade tyrants to adopt his idea for their own happiness; Chapter 3 displays and discusses the dark side of Xenophon's ethical system. Finally, Chapter 4 studies the supplement of Xenophon's highly political model of moral education in his *Poroi* and *Oeconomicus*. On the whole, this part will show that Xenophon's thought on moral education is more profound and systematic than it was usually considered to be and deserves to be treated as a theory, though it is not always free of faults and contradictions.

Chapter 1: Nature and Origin of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*

I. Introduction

As the longest extant work of Xenophon, the nature of the *Cyropaedia* is always in disputation.¹⁹¹ It treats almost every subject Xenophon discusses in his other works, such as leadership, philosophy, education, military techniques and Persian customs. In the late Roman Republic, readers already felt that this work was so complex that it needed certain explanations. In one letter to his younger brother, Cicero points out that the *Cyropaedia* is not history, but offers a model of righteous exercise of authority ('non ad historiae fidem scriptus sed ad effigiem iusti imperi') (Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.23).

We have no idea whether Quintus Cicero did agree with what his elder brother asserts. However, it is certain that most modern scholars do not think that this simple explanation is satisfactory, because the content of the *Cyropaedia* is so complex and varied that it cannot be oversimplified in such a way. Walter Miller points out in his preface to the translation of the *Cyropaedia* that 'the *Cyropaedia* brings together and sums up the results of nearly all of Xenophon's literary activity.'¹⁹² Eighty years later, in her monograph on the *Cyropaedia*, Deborah Gera still has to admit that she is still uncertain about the nature and purpose of the very work she studies.¹⁹³ Obviously, a description like that is not praise of Xenophon's writing skills; for that is as much as to say what Xenophon writes is rather confusing for readers. And we would have to admit that if we can find no better way to understand Xenophon's intention. Even Bodil Due, a steadfast defender of Xenophon's literary achievement, has to comment that 'Xenophon does not present his reader with a fully developed or consistent philosophy. His ideology is made up from many different sources and he is

¹⁹¹ Carlier (2010), 327; Reichel (2010), 420.

¹⁹² Miller (1914a), x.

¹⁹³ Gera (1993), 1.

inspired and repelled by many aspects of Athenian and Spartan ideas and values.¹⁹⁴

Other scholars would not give up so easily. They hold the belief that as Xenophon spent much time and energy on this lengthy work, it must have a clear intention for him to do so; and if the purpose is not explicit, it must be hidden and open to guess. J. Luccioni considers that Xenophon's real purpose is to reunite the scattered Greeks against Persia;¹⁹⁵ Pierre Carlier even believes that Xenophon is attempting to guard against the Greek nation's future corruption after their successful conquest of Persia.¹⁹⁶ Nevertheless, as Bodil Due justly criticises, it is quite farfetched to imagine that Xenophon would choose Persia as his ideal model if his intention is to defeat and conquer Persia.¹⁹⁷ And the attitude towards Persia in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* is very alien to his really pan-Hellenic work, namely his *Agésilas*.¹⁹⁸ Paul Christesen supposes that the *Cyropaedia* can and should be read as a pamphlet on practical military reform with special relevance to the Spartan state,¹⁹⁹ and he only takes the disguise of Persia to make his writing better known.²⁰⁰ And it is really interesting for us to find another scholar, V. Azoulay, who suggests just the opposite that Xenophon decides to write about Persia and Cyrus the Great because he has been disappointed and has lost interest in Sparta by then.²⁰¹ These two assumptions are not supported by solid proofs and neither is actually convincing.²⁰²

In recent years, most researchers on Xenophon tend to derive their own theories on the basis of Cicero's idea, that the *Cyropaedia* is actually a work on politics and

¹⁹⁴ Due (1989), 228-229.

¹⁹⁵ Luccioni (1947), 203, 232, 305.

¹⁹⁶ Carlier (2010), 366.

¹⁹⁷ Due (1989), 23.

¹⁹⁸ Delebecque (1957), 467.

¹⁹⁹ Christesen (2006), 47.

²⁰⁰ Christesen (2006), 63.

²⁰¹ Azoulay (2004b), 153.

²⁰² For Christesen's view, Tuplin (1994) has already pointed out that the connection between Sparta and Persia in the *Cyropaedia* cannot be built up directly. In the case of Azoulay's hypothesis, we are still in lack of evidence for Xenophon's later relationship to Sparta; and his supposition that Xenophon might feel disappointed with Sparta cannot be supported by evidence in Xenophon's extant works other than his *Lac.* 14.1-7, in which he only mildly criticises the contemporary Spartans' corruption. But Sparta's image in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Agésilas* is always positive, though not necessarily perfect.

art of government. J. Farber sets forth that the theory presented in the *Cyropaedia* dominated the Hellenistic world in the following three centuries,²⁰³ and it focuses on politics by discussing ‘the successful king of an empire’.²⁰⁴ W.R. Newell believes that the *Cyropaedia* discusses the fundamental possibilities of political life, and is in this respect very similar to Plato’s *Laws* and Aristotle’s *Politica*.²⁰⁵ And Deborah Gera goes further by asserting that Xenophon wishes to ensure the work a place within the tradition of πολιτεία literature.²⁰⁶

Judging from the text of the *Cyropaedia* itself, the explanation that the work follows the tradition of πολιτεία literature is much more reasonable than most other hypotheses. However, there is still one more contradiction left, which is the inconsistency between the title and the text. If the subject of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* is indeed political system and government, then why is the work titled ‘The Education of Cyrus’ instead of ‘Constitution of Persia’, as another πολιτεία literary output produced by Xenophon himself (the *Spartan Constitution*) and the two manuals on Athenian politics by Old Oligarch (Pseudo-Xenophon) and Aristotle (in disputation) do?

What makes the case even more troublesome is that the *Spartan Constitution*, another writing of Xenophon and the first work on its subject,²⁰⁷ seems not to be a typical work on political organisation, though nobody would deny that it definitely belongs to the genre of πολιτεία literature. Jacqueline Bordes, one researcher on the genre of *politeia* in classical age, believes that on the one hand, Xenophon’s *Spartan Constitution* shares common character with other contemporary politeia works;²⁰⁸ while on the other hand, it also shows many unique features in comparison to Old Oligarch’s *Athenian Constitution*,²⁰⁹ the *Athenian Constitution* ascribed to Aristotle

²⁰³ Farber (1979), 497.

²⁰⁴ Farber (1979), 504.

²⁰⁵ Newell (1983), 889.

²⁰⁶ Gera (1993), 11.

²⁰⁷ Rebenich (1998), 14.

²⁰⁸ Bordes (1982), 202-203.

²⁰⁹ Bordes (1982), 166.

and other extant fragments. In other words, the *Spartan Constitution* is an atypical work in the genre of *politeia*. Michael Lipka observes that the title Λακεδαιμονίων Πολιτεία is rather surprising, as what Xenophon discusses here are just ‘public affairs’ in a very loose sense.²¹⁰ As a matter of fact, Xenophon spends most of the passages in this work explaining the Spartan system of education. The institutional structures to collect tax, to run the Council of Elders, and to deal with lawsuits seem not to be what Xenophon cares about, though they are of crucial importance in Aristotle’s political works.

Up to now, our analysis on the very nature of the *Cyropaedia* is still confusing and full of problems, seeing that Xenophon would talk much about political theory in a work on education of Cyrus, and discuss affairs of education in the *Spartan Constitution*. In my opinion, the key to solving the paradox is the particular understanding of ‘education’ from a social perspective in Xenophon’s mind. In scholarship, the relationship of the literary images of Persia and Sparta (not precisely the contents and objects of the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution*) has already been studied by Christopher Tuplin, who used to compare the two states in Xenophon’s context but drew a generally negative conclusion on their essential resemblance. In his opinion, it is by no means Xenophon’s intention to depict ancient Persia as a duplication of Sparta in his age,²¹¹ and some differences between these two regimes are quite evident.²¹² Nevertheless, in my view, although Tuplin is quite right in stressing that Cyrus’ Persia in Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia* is not modelled on Sparta in reality, the similarity between these two states is still undeniable and reflects Xenophon’s personal understanding of politics and education, which are closely connected in his context. In order to see that clearly, it is necessary for us to compare the content of the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution* in detail.

²¹⁰ Lipka (2002), 97.

²¹¹ Tuplin (1994), 162.

²¹² Tuplin (1994), 138-139.

II. The *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution* Compared

Judging from the titles, we should expect that the *Cyropaedia* is a work on the education of Cyrus, while the *Spartan Constitution* discusses the political organisations and structures of Spartan government, which indicates that the two works should not share much in common. And in length, the *Spartan Constitution* is by no means comparable to the complex and varied *Cyropaedia*. Nevertheless, close examination of the contents shows that the two works treat a lot of common subjects, for example the obedience and piety, importance of self-control, physical training, moral supervision, public life, as well as the similar fates of the two hegemonies, though certain differences between the two works do exist.

a. Fostering of obedience

Obedience of subjects is the first and foremost aim Cyrus pursued in the *Cyropaedia*, which includes two important characteristics: piety to gods and reverence to the king. After the capture of Babylon, Xenophon reports that ‘And Cyrus considered that the piety (εὐσέβεια) of his friends was a good thing for him, too; for he reasoned that when embarking on a voyage, people prefer to set sail with pious companions rather than with those who are believed to have committed some impiety. And besides, Cyrus reasoned that if all his associates were god-fearing men, they would be less inclined to commit crime against one another or against themselves, for he considered himself their benefactor.’ (Xen. Cyr. 8.1.25) Here we can see the author’s intention is both educational and political. While piety can be justly seen as one important aspect of the aim of education Xenophon designs here, it also clearly serves a political purpose, because god-fearing subjects would not be a threat to Cyrus and his reign. Due to that cause, Cyrus tries his best to implant the idea of piety to his followers whenever an opportunity is offered. For example, the

watchword Cyrus used in war is always ‘Ζεὺς σύμμαχος /σωτὴρ καὶ ἡγεμὼν’ (Xen. Cyr. 3.3.58; 7.1.10). And after his soldiers win a victory, the first thing Cyrus asked them to do is ‘go to dinner, as men beloved of God and brave and wise; pour libations to the gods, raise the song of victory, and at the same time be on the lookout for orders that may come.’ (Xen. Cyr. 4.1.6) By this order, Cyrus successfully combined the reward of the victory, the blessing of gods, the military discipline and the reverence to his commandership together, and he chose to attribute the highest glory to god rather than himself. This is a wise combination of the education of morality and the art of governorship.

In the *Cyropaedia*, Cyrus also managed to secure the reverence of himself through his magic charisma.²¹³ Throughout the whole work one scene repeatedly appears: when Cyrus finished his lecture and asked for a better plan from his followers, those people would agree to adopt his idea without reservation (Xen. Cyr. 4.4.8). And if they did speak, we would hear praise of Cyrus instead of objection to him. ‘O my king,’ one of his relatives said, ‘for to me you seem to be a born king no less than is the sovereign of the bees in a hive.’²¹⁴ For as the bees always willingly obey (παίθονται) the queen-bee and none of them deserts the place where she stays; and as not one fails to follow her if she goes anywhere else — so marvellous a yearning to be ruled by her is innate to them; so it seemed to me that men are also drawn by something like the same sort of instinct toward you.’ (Xen. Cyr. 5.1.24-25) Another follower of Cyrus, Tigranes also told Cyrus that ‘you need never be surprised when I keep silence. For my mind has been disciplined not to offer counsel but to do what you command.’ (Xen. Cyr. 5.1.27) Therefore, the obedience of those subjects in front of Cyrus was absolute; yet it was not achieved by Cyrus’ authority

²¹³ By using the term ‘charisma’, I am following the usage of Max Weber in his famous *Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, in which he describes ‘charisma’ as ‘a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, superhuman, or at least specifically exceptional powers or qualities’ (Weber (1947), 358). Of course, the use of Max Weber’s term does not mean that I actually believe that Max Weber’s influential idea must come directly from Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*; but I do think that the religious and supernatural features of leadership described by them separately are similar and in many aspects correspondent.

²¹⁴ Further discussion of the queen bee metaphor will be given in Part 3, Chapter 2 of this thesis.

or suppression, but as the natural outcome of Cyrus' personal charismatic character.

How is that possible? Of course most modern readers would suppose the situation is oversimplified or even totally made up by Xenophon, yet Xenophon does seem to suggest that the effect is possible to be realised, at least in theory. His logic is clearly shown in the admonition of Cyrus' father to him:

But there is another road, a short cut, to what is much better — namely, to willing obedience. For people only wish to obey the man which they believe to be wiser than themselves. And you might recognise that this is so in many instances but particularly in the case of the sick: how readily they call in those who are to prescribe what they must do; and at sea how cheerfully the passengers obey the captain; and how earnestly travellers desire not to get separated from those who they think are better acquainted with the road than they are (ἐπὶ δὲ τὸ κρεῖττον τούτου πολὺ, τὸ ἐκόντας πείθεσθαι, ἄλλη ἐστὶ συντομωτέρα. ὃν γὰρ ἂν ἡγήσωνται περὶ τοῦ συμφέροντος ἑαυτοῖς φρονιμώτερον ἑαυτῶν εἶναι, τούτῳ οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὑπερηδέως πείθονται. γνοίης δ' ἂν ὅτι τοῦθ' οὕτως ἔχει ἐν ἄλλοις τε πολλοῖς καὶ δὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖς κάμνουσιν, ὥς προθύμως τοὺς ἐπιτάζοντας ὅ τι χρὴ ποιεῖν καλοῦσι· καὶ ἐν θαλάττῃ δὲ ὥς προθύμως τοῖς κυβερνήταις οἱ συμπλέοντες πείθονται· καὶ οὐς γ' ἂν νομίσωσί τινες βέλτιον αὐτῶν ὁδοὺς εἰδέναι, ὥς ἰσχυρῶς τούτων οὐδ' ἀπολείπεσθαι θέλουσιν). (Xen. Cyr. 1.6.21)

According to the same logic, the political leader is perfectly capable of 'educating' his subjects to be obedient by his own example, if he is competent himself and his reign is really beneficial to people. This is a typical way of Socratic thinking.²¹⁵ As a matter of fact, Xenophon does believe that Cyrus the Great unified the Persian Empire by educating his subjects to be obedient to himself, which is justly taken as his greatest merit above all. He reports to us that the charisma of Cyrus was so miraculous that 'people obeyed Cyrus willingly, although some of

²¹⁵ Cf. Brock (2013), 150-152.

them were distant from him a journey of many days, and others of many months; others, although they had never seen him, and still others who knew well that they never should see him. Nevertheless they were all willing to be his subjects (Κύρω γοῦν ἴσμεν ἐθελήσαντας πείθεσθαι τοὺς μὲν ἀπέχοντας παμπόλλων ἡμερῶν ὁδόν, τοὺς δὲ καὶ μηνῶν, τοὺς δὲ οὐδ' ἐωρακότας πρόποτ' αὐτόν, τοὺς δὲ καὶ εἰδόμενους ὅτι οὐδ' ἂν ἴδοιεν, καὶ ὅμως ἤθελον αὐτῷ ὑπακούειν).’ (Xen. Cyr. 1.1.3) Through this confidence and obedience, Cyrus the Great secured the unity and safety of the whole Persian Empire (Xen. Cyr. 1.1.4). And Xenophon praises him in an almost encomiastic tone: ‘He ruled over these nations, even though they do not speak the same language as he, nor one nation the same as another; for all that, he was able to cover so vast a region with the fear which he inspired, that he struck all men with terror and no one tried to withstand him; and he was able to awaken in all so lively a desire to please him, that they always wished to be guided by his will.’ (Xen. Cyr. 1.1.5) Here again we see an intention both educational and political: the means Cyrus adopted is moral and educational, while his aim and the outcome are vividly political.

Instead of discussing in detail the relationship between an ideal king and his subjects in the manner of the *Cyropaedia*, the *Spartan Constitution* focuses on the effects of Spartan law on its people. The structure and narrative of the whole work is much simpler and more concise. However, the key points on Spartans’ obedience comprise perfectly an outline of the corresponding texts in the *Cyropaedia*. Here the ‘supervisor (ὁ παιδονόμος)’, respected as the educator of children (Xen. Lac., 2.2), and the laws take place of Cyrus the Great.²¹⁶ And the legislator Lycurgus substitutes the role of gods and makes his will obeyed by people in the manner of legislation. It is quite significant that at the funeral the Spartan king should be respected (προτιμάω) like demigod (ὁ ἥρωας), not ordinary man (ὁ ἄνθρωπος) (Xen.

²¹⁶ In modern context, of course, the obedience to a single person and that to state authority, as well as citizens’ obedience to their political leader and that of conquered people, must be quite different. But these themes show much less differences in the ancient imperial context. Therefore, Xenophon’s combination of the discussions of these topics should not be taken as his logical errors.

Lac. 15.9). Xenophon tells us that if Spartan boys fight against each other privately, ‘any passer-by is entitled to separate the fighting parties. And if anyone disobeys this arbitrator, the supervisor takes him to the ephors. And the ephors mete out severe punishment because they want to ensure that hostile feelings never prevail over obedience to the law (πείθεσθαι τοῖς νόμοις)’ (Xen. *Lac.* 4.6). Therefore, we can see that the strict requirements on obedience in the *Spartan Constitution* are very similar and correspondent to those in the *Cyropaedia*.

b. Self-control

According to Xenophon’s narrative in the *Cyropaedia*, though the charisma of the king himself is powerful and efficient in most situations, the virtue of self-control is still indispensable when his subjects are beyond his and anyone’s supervision. Xenophon emphasises that by making his own self-control (σωφροσύνη) an example Cyrus the Great ‘disposed all to practice that virtue more diligently’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.30). In Xenophon’s opinion, it is beyond any doubt something manageable in moral education and it is Cyrus’ duty to educate his people’s self-control by his own behaviour. Because ‘when the weaker members of society see that one who is in a position where he may indulge himself to excess is still under self-control, they naturally strive all the more not to be found guilty of any excessive indulgence’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.30). This kind of education may have striking positive effects on the morality of his subjects. Cyrus simply trained his associates ‘not to spit or to wipe the nose in public, and not to turn round to look at anything’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.42), and the result was that ‘there remains even unto this day evidence of their moderate fare and of their working off by exercise what they eat: for even to the present time it is a breach of decorum for a Persian to spit or to blow his nose or to appear afflicted with flatulence; it is a breach of decorum also to be seen going apart either to make water or for anything else of that kind.’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.2.16) The description of Xenophon

intends to show us that self-control can be taught through the example of a good leader to his followers, even in certain trivial detail of manners and behaviour.

At the same time, I believe that we also take notice that this kind of moral education also has a political aim. When Persians had firmly controlled the political power of the whole empire, Cyrus immediately emphasised to them the importance of self-control when they become master themselves. He advised them, 'Recognising all this, we ought to practice virtue even more than we did before we secured these advantages, for we may be sure that the more a man has, the more people will envy him and plot against him and become his enemies, particularly if, in another case, he draws his wealth and service from unwilling hands.' (Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.77) In another case he agitatedly questioned his followers:

ἐννοήσατε δὲ κάκεῖνο τίνα πρόφασιν ἔχοντες ἂν προσιοίμεθα κακίονες ἢ πρόσθεν γενέσθαι. πότερον ὅτι ἄρχομεν; ἀλλ' οὐ δήπου τὸν ἄρχοντα τῶν ἀρχομένων πονηρότερον προσήκει εἶναι. ἀλλ' ὅτι εὐδαιμονέστεροι δοκοῦμεν νῦν ἢ πρότερον εἶναι; ἔπειτα τῇ εὐδαιμονίᾳ φήσκει τις τὴν κακίαν [ἐπι]πρέπειν; ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐπεὶ κεκτήμεθα δούλους, τούτους κολάσομεν, ἢν πονηροὶ ᾖσι;

What excuse should we offer for allowing ourselves become less deserving than before? That we are rulers? But, you know, it is not proper for the ruler to be worse than his subjects. Or that we seem to be more fortunate than before? Will anyone then maintain that vice is the proper ornament for good fortune? Or shall we plead that since we have slaves, we can punish them if they are bad? Why, what propriety is there in anyone's punishing others for viciousness or indolence, when he himself is also bad? (Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.83)

In my view, these passages clearly indicate the relationship between the moral character of self-control and politics. Self-control helps masters to perform virtue even when they are alone or only among their own slaves, and it is just the respectable virtue that secures Persians their mastership and their authority as well as protecting them from the hostility and jealousy of their subjects or slaves. That logic

is typical for Xenophon and reveals his general attitude to the relationship between moral education and art of government.

A corresponding passage in the *Spartan Constitution* on boys' education also treats the subject of self-control:

When they cease to be children and attain puberty, the other Greeks release them from the παιδαγωγός, set them free from their διδασκαλός; no one is in charge of them anymore, but they are allowed to live as they like. Lycurgus, however, instituted quite different customs from these too. Realising that men of this age are very high-spirited, that insolence predominates, and that the most intense physical desires beset them, he imposed on them much labour and contrived that they should have very little leisure. In addition, he laid it down that if anyone shirked these duties, he no longer had a share in civic rights. He ensured that not only the magistrates but also each one's relatives took care that the youths did not completely ruin their reputation in the city by their cowardice. Furthermore, since he wanted them to be imbued with a strong sense of respect, he ordered that even in the streets they should keep their hands under their cloaks, walk silently, turn around nowhere, and keep their eyes fixed [sc. on the ground] in front of their feet. In this way it was manifest that the male sex had greater powers of self-control (σωφροσνεΐν) than the female sex. To put it another way, you would be more likely to hear a stone statue speak than them, you would consider them to be shyer than the very pupils in their own eyes. And when they attend the common mess, you would have to be content to hear them speak only when spoken to. (Xen. *Lac.* 3.1-5)

A close observation would reveal interesting similarity of content as well as terms used between the passages on the same topic in the two works studied here. In the *Cyropaedia*, self-control turns to be extremely important when Persians become masters of the whole empire. While in the *Spartan Constitution*, self-control is crucial when lads are released from their supervisors and become the masters of their

own bodies. The moral education in the *Cyropaedia* serves political purpose and the political system in the *Spartan Constitution* secures a successful education.

c. Military Organisation and Physical Training

The application of military organisation into social control is one noteworthy feature in the *Cyropaedia*. Through Chrysantas, a competent military general in Cyrus' army, Xenophon justifies this means by pointing out that military affairs are correspondent to other spheres in public life, 'what city that is hostile could be taken or what city that is friendly could be preserved by soldiers who are insubordinate? What army of disobedient men could gain a victory? How could men be more easily defeated in battle than when each begins to think of his own safety? And what possible success could be achieved by those who do not obey their superiors? What state could be administered according to its laws, or what private establishments could be maintained, and how could ships arrive at their destination?' (Xen. Cyr. 8.1.2) These questions intend to argue that military discipline and organisation can be helpful and even indispensable in the arrangement of other public affairs.

Again, it is Cyrus the Great who turned Chrysantas' idea into reality. First of all, Cyrus borrowed the mode of military organisation to manage and centralise administrative functions. In the *Cyropaedia*. 8.1.14-15, Xenophon describes for us Cyrus' art of administrative organisation:

As he [Cyrus] thus pondered how the business of administration might be successfully conducted and how he still might have the desired leisure, he somehow happened to think of his military organization: in general, the sergeants care for the ten men under them, the lieutenants for the sergeants, the colonels for the lieutenants, the generals for the colonels, and thus no one is uncared for, even though there be many brigades; and when the commander-in-chief wishes to do anything with his army, it is sufficient for him

to issue his commands only to his brigadier-generals. On this same model, then, Cyrus centralised the administrative functions also. And so it was possible for him, by communicating with only a few officers, to have no part of his administration uncared for. In this way he now enjoyed more leisure than one who has care of a single household or a single ship.

Therefore, by simply communicating with a few officers, Cyrus would successfully manage all administrative affairs throughout the whole empire with ‘more leisure than one who has care of a single household or a single ship’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.14-15).

In the second place, Cyrus also adopted hunting (one kind of military training) as one means of physical education (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.34), both for his followers and for himself, as any competent leader must be expert in the arts and pursuits of war (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.37). This idea is consistent to Xenophon’s own suggestion in his *Cynegeticus*, in which he claims that ‘I charge the young not to despise hunting or any other schooling (παιδεία). For these are the means by which men become good in war and in all things out of which must come excellence in thought and word and deed.’²¹⁷

In the polis described in the *Spartan Constitution*, we also find that the Spartan boys are organised and trained by very strict military and athletic discipline. The supervisor is allowed to punish the boys with whips and order each of them to wear one garment throughout the year. The boys are also required to endure hunger (Xen. *Lac.* 2.1-5). Similar to Cyrus’ idea, the principle of Lycurgus also considers hunting as a noble occupation for youths, as he ‘made hunting the customary and noble pastime for men of this age group [youth], unless public duty prevented it’ (Xen. *Lac.* 4.7). And even freeborn girls are asked to take part in physical training so that they

²¹⁷ Xen. *Cyn.* 1.18. Both the *Cyropaedia* and the *Cynegeticus* express the idea that hunting contributes to body exercise and is helpful to the state, which should be counted as a type of παιδεία. Frederick Beck takes it as the evident of Xenophon’s conservativeness (Beck (1964), 249). Nevertheless, in my opinion, this idea fits Xenophon’s innovative and broad understanding of education very well and serves as an indispensable element of his thought system, which should not be taken as something unoriginal or out of date.

may be able to bear healthy children in future (Xen. *Lac.* 1.4). All these measures show great similarity to the policies adopted in the *Cyropaedia*.

d. Supervision of Education and Public Morality

One innovative concept of Xenophon is that the supervisors of basic education and public morality should possess high virtues themselves. In typical classical Athenian domestic life, the task of bringing up and educating children is usually taken by slaves, women and old men.²¹⁸ Therefore, almost no Athenian writers pay attention to the educators of basic knowledge and manner except for Xenophon and Aristotle. This idea is vividly revealed in both the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution*. In the former, Xenophon expands the traditional sense of παιδεία and devises a systematic supervision for all-life moral education; while in the latter, Xenophon's attention largely focuses on παιδεία in the traditional sense, which means upbringing and education of children and youths. Nevertheless, very similar arts of moral supervision can still be found in Xenophon's idealised Persian and Spartan societies.

Through the words of Cyrus, Xenophon explains why base and vulgar men should not undertake the role of supervisors. He points out that 'the base oftentimes finds a larger following of congenial spirits than the noble. For since vice makes her appeal through the pleasures of the moment, she has their assistance to persuade many to accept her views; but virtue, leading uphill, is not at all clever at attracting men at first sight and without reflection; and especially is this true, when there are others who call in the opposite direction, to what is downhill and easy.' (Xen. *Cyr.* 2.2.24. Cf. Hes. *Op.* 287-295. Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.28) In that case, the negative influence of a bad comrade (no matter whether he is the supervisor or simply an intimate friend) is disastrous and 'we must weed out such men at any cost' (Xen. *Cyr.* 2.2.25).

²¹⁸ Christes (2000), 150.

According to Xenophon's theory, the choice of supervisors for Cyrus' followers and subjects must be cautious. In fact, the best choice must be the parents and governors themselves. Cyrus spoke to the Persians as follows, 'and as for our boys, as many as shall be born to us, let us educate them here. For we ourselves shall be better, if we aim to set before the boys as good examples as we can in ourselves, and the boys could not easily turn out bad, even if they should wish to, if they neither see nor hear anything vicious but spend their days in good and noble (καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός) pursuits.' (Xen. Cyr. 7.5.86) On the other hand, the ultimate educator of these future parents is Cyrus himself, as the comment of Chrysantas showed, 'Well, gentlemen, I have noticed often enough before now that a good ruler is not at all different from a good father. For as fathers provide for their children so that they may never be in want of the good things of life, so Cyrus seems to me now to be giving us counsel how we may best continue in prosperity.' (Xen. Cyr. 8.1.1) In that sense, the duty of an ideal political leader is very similar to that of a responsible father.²¹⁹ Therefore, it is quite proper for Cyrus the Great to offer moral advice and supervision for his subjects.

In order to carry out strict supervision to control his subjects, Cyrus also employed a lot of helpers, who were called king's eyes and ears (ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὅτα βασιλεώς). They secretly supervise the manner and morality of Cyrus' subjects, and make reports to Cyrus himself. Cyrus also tried his best to organise all his people to supervise each other, so that everyone would feel he is under the supervision at any location and any time, and therefore took care to pursue virtue as best as he can (Xen. Cyr. 8.2.10-12).

Similarly, in the political system presented in the *Spartan Constitution*, the 'supervisor (παιδονόμος)' (Xen. Lac. 2.10) of Spartan children and youths must be strict and responsible. If he has to be absent, the boys would still not lack rulers. Because the supervisor must give authority to any citizen who chance to be present in order that he would undertake the task of supervision temporarily (Xen. Lac.

²¹⁹ The father imagery is very important in Xenophon's political thought. See Brock (2013), 31.

2.10-11). The whole system of inspection is complete, strict, and even harsh, which represents something quite alien to general Greek concepts but going on well with Xenophon's personal educational and political theory.

e. Emphasis on Public Life

In the *Cyropaedia*, Cyrus encouraged his subjects to take part in public life as much as they can. For that purpose, he employed many supervisors to maintain public order, as I have already described in the chapter above. Beyond that, Cyrus the Great also made his own tent (σκηνή) big enough to accommodate all people he might invite to dinner in one day, and frequently treats his followers to dinner (Xen. *Cyr.* 2.1.30). In Cyrus' opinion, these public symposiums also have one kind of educational function, for 'those who came would not be willing to do anything dishonourable or immoral, partly because they were in the presence of their sovereign and partly also because they knew that, whatever they did, they would be under the eyes of the best men there' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.16). And if some people refused to come, Cyrus would suspect that they might be 'guilty of some form of intemperance or injustice or neglect of duty' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.16). And he would use every means to force the absent men to join the public banquet next time (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.17-20).

It is quite interesting that we can find another tent in the *Spartan Constitution*, this time it is a public mess tent (σκηνή) assigned by Lycurgus, in order to ensure that even kings can have dinner together with his people and take part in public life (Xen. *Lac.* 15.4). The reason for doing this is also the same: the custom of preferring to stay at home to participating in public life is considered to be responsible for a great deal of misconduct (Xen. *Lac.* 5.2-3), while the attention to keep their behaviour proper and moderate in public is of great help for elevating the morality of common people (Xen. *Lac.* 5.6-7). Old people continue to participate, too; for

Lycurgus required them to stand for the election to the Council of Elders (γεροντία), so that they would not neglect high principles even in old age (Xen. *Lac.* 10.1). Again the contents of the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution* share much in common.

f. The Same Destiny of the Two Powers

It is also noteworthy that both works we examine here have a short epilogue (*Cyr.* 8.8; *Lac.* 14), in which the destiny of Persia and Sparta after their great leaders' death is summarised. In scholarship there are heated disputations around the authenticity of both texts.²²⁰ In that case, I believe it is necessary to examine briefly the comments of early scholars on the *Cyropaedia* 8.8 first.

In the Loeb edition of the *Cyropaedia* prepared in 1914, Walter Miller believes that 8.8 is certainly a later addition. His foundation is that this chapter 'spoils the perfect unity of the work'. Nevertheless, because the so-called 'addition' does appear in all manuscripts and former editions, he decided to leave it here but recommended the reader 'to close the book at this point and read no further'.²²¹ However, the confidence of Walter Miller is now proved to be too arbitrary, as few scholars nowadays would totally agree with his rather oversimplified conclusion.

Some researchers still suppose the same problems do exist. James Tatum thinks that the epilogue unreasonably shows that the whole system of Cyrus failed after his death, and can only represent the attitude of some anti-Persian writers instead of Xenophon.²²² But most scholars believe that the connection between 8.8 and former passages can be built up, both in text and in logic. Paula Sage argues that the narrative in 8.8.2 closely connects 8.8 to 8.7.²²³ And Deborah Gera believes that Xenophon hints in the passages immediately preceding that the tragic end of the

²²⁰ Due (1989), 16-20; Bordes (1982), 165.

²²¹ Miller (1914b), 438-439.

²²² Tatum (1989), 222.

²²³ Sage (1995), 167-168.

Persian Empire is already inevitable in the final years of Cyrus' reign,²²⁴ as Cyrus turned from an ideal leader to a despot after the capture of Babylon.²²⁵ And the text contains no problem at all from a linguistic view.²²⁶ Bodil Due considers that the problem presented in 8.8 has already been stated in general throughout the whole work.²²⁷ In sum, the general academic opinion today is that the *Cyropaedia* 8.8 was written by Xenophon.²²⁸

Similar cases and conclusions are also applicable to the *Spartan Constitution* 14, whose scholarship has been thoroughly discussed by Michael Lipka.²²⁹ In short, the doubt of authenticity of both *Cyropaedia* 8.8 and the *Spartan Constitution* 14 cannot be supported by any textual or manuscript evidence; it is rather subjective and is perhaps based on some misunderstanding of Xenophon's thought and common literary tradition of ancient writers. In my view, there is no sufficient reason to doubt the authenticity of the *Cyropaedia* 8.8 and the *Spartan Constitution* 14 due to the change of narrative tone. First, the idea of 'the decline and fall' of morality and constitution is nothing strange among Greek writers. In Hesiod's *Works and Days*, we see clear sign of degeneration among the five generations created by Zeus (Hes. *Op.* 109-201). And in Plato's *Republic*, Socrates also explains why even the best constitution, namely 'the Spartan one' would change from an ideal status into an inferior timocracy (Pl. *Resp.* 545d ff), and then from bad to even worse (Pl. *Resp.* 551a-579e). In that case, readers in ancient Greece would not feel it odd when they found Xenophon identifying a similar decline in Persian morality and in the Spartan constitution after the deaths of their respective heroes. In the second place, the difference between the former and present condition of Persia and Sparta may be common sense among classical Greeks. Aeschylus draws vivid contrast between Cyrus the Great as well as other glorious Persian ancestral kings and the incompetent

²²⁴ Gera (1993), 286.

²²⁵ Gera (1993), 296-297.

²²⁶ Gera (1993), 300.

²²⁷ Due (1989), 20.

²²⁸ Due (1989), 16.

²²⁹ Lipka (2002), 27-31. See also Marchant (1925), xxi-xxii; Chrimes (1948), 3-17.

Xerxes in the *Persians* (Aesch. *Pers.* 765-783). Isocrates also praised the feat and fame of Cyrus the Great in the *Letter to Philip*, 66-67, while he depreciated Cyrus' offspring in his times in the *Panegyricus* (Isoc. *Paneg.* 144-153). And Plato expresses the same opinion in the *Laws* (Pl. *Leg.* 694a-696b). Perhaps Aeschines of Sphettus, another Socratic philosopher living at Xenophon's time, also praises Cyrus the Great in his lost work (see Aeschines Socraticus, fr. 33 (in Giannantoni)). But its content and whether it is about ideal leadership is unknown. There is no inconsistency in these remarks and no contemporary audience or reader would suppose so.²³⁰ And it is also needless to say that the power of Sparta did decline after the Peloponnesian War, at least after her defeat by Thebes; while nobody at that time would wonder at a moralist like Xenophon attributing the cause of Sparta's decline to the corruption of morality. In sum, I believe it is quite safe to study Xenophon's thought by these two texts before any further textual evidence appears. And the comparison is helpful for us to realise that the two works do contain more similarities.

According to Xenophon's narrative, after Cyrus' death, 'his children at once fell into dissension, states and nations began to revolt, and everything began to deteriorate.' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.2) The most important change is that Persians became no longer as pious and obedient as before; and the very reason is the kings and officers lost their sense of honour. In later days, not a single person trusts the governors, because 'their lack of character is notorious' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.3). The direct result was the morality Cyrus the Great set up fell apart, and 'all the inhabitants of Asia have been turned to wickedness and wrong-doing' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.5). And Xenophon comments himself here, 'whatever the character of the rulers is, such also that of the people under them for the most part becomes'.²³¹ Now every virtue in Cyrus' time

²³⁰ Sandridge (2012), 10.

²³¹ Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.5. This comment is crucial for our study here, which reveals Xenophon's basic attitude to the function of moral education through politics. The same idea also reappears in Xenophon's other works, such as his *Agex.* 10.2 and *Hier.* 11.11-12. Compared to other educational doctrines in his time, there are two innovative key points in Xenophon's system of moral education. First of all, the dominant educator must be a noble, rational and competent politician who governs and controls the whole society, which makes him different from women and servants (for example παιδαγωγός) who are responsible for moral education according to traditional Greek custom; in the second place, Xenophon's receiver of moral education can be people of any social status, including

declined inevitably. Persians became dishonest in money matters (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.6); they were addicted to wine (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.8-9); their bodies became weak (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.12) and effeminate (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.15); justice was neglected (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.13-14); military training was abandoned and the defence of the Persian Empire had to rely on Greek mercenaries (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.26). By these descriptions, Xenophon proves to us that the death of his hero brought an end to the education abruptly. These contents are not irrelevant to the key issue of the whole work, but explain the importance and central role of Cyrus the Great (the ideal leader) in the activity of moral education of the whole society.

Then what is the case in Sparta after Lycurgus' death? Xenophon writes, 'if anyone asked me, whether I believe that the laws of Lycurgus still remain unchanged today, by Zeus, I could not state this with confidence anymore.' (Xen. *Lac.* 14.1) That is because the morality of Spartans was also corrupted. The leading men preferred to live abroad than stay in their hometown (Xen. *Lac.* 14.4); people struggled among themselves to seize power, while they did not care that they should be worthy to rule (Xen. *Lac.* 14.5); instead of asking Spartans to lead them as before, other Greeks tried their best to prevent corrupted Spartans from taking the lead again (Xen. *Lac.* 14.6). Although the situation of Sparta still seems to be better than Xenophon's Persia, the nature and the tendency of the developments show no differences at all.

g. Similar Nature: Ideal Leader Ruling according to Wise Law

In recent scholarship, the *Cyropaedia* is often depicted as a work on absolute monarchy governing without law. W.R. Newell points out that 'at the heart of Xenophon's political thought is what we may term an experimental project for

soldiers, labour workers, women and even some slaves and barbarians, which makes his theory distinctive and differs from that of Plato, Aristotle and Isocrates (who mentions the importance of moral exemplification of political leaders in his *To Nicocles*, 31 but does not demonstrate the opinion systematically and in detail).

reforming tyranny into a tacit extra category — rule over willing subjects without law.’²³² Quite a few scholars agree with that opinion. David Johnson believes that in the *Cyropaedia* Xenophon is to some extent critical of empire because it is run by a person instead of by law.²³³ Christopher Whidden goes even further by supposing that Xenophon is ‘very sceptical and critical of empire’.²³⁴ In his view, the *Cyropaedia* presents two ways of government by political leaders (rule of despot and rule of lawgiver), but neither is successful.²³⁵ The real intention of Xenophon is to contrast Cyrus with Socrates²³⁶ and persuade readers to turn to his Socratic teachings presented in the *Memorabilia*, because philosophy is the only right method to carry out moral education.²³⁷ However, as the section above indicates, the contrast between Cyrus the Great’s reign and the later decline of the Persian Empire is not the privilege of Xenophon but is very common among classical Greek writers, which does not necessarily mean that Xenophon is critical of Cyrus’ government itself. And the encomiastic tone adopted for Cyrus at the very opening of the *Cyropaedia* (Xen. Cyr. 1.1.1-3) shows nothing compatible with Christopher Whidden’s theory.

In my opinion, these suppositions misunderstand the content of Cyrus’ moral education. It is imparted by a king to his subjects, yet that is the only similarity between Cyrus’ mode and the so-called absolute monarchy. For the education described by Xenophon, three key elements are really indispensable: the educator must be an ideal leader; the people must be willing and obedient; and the education must be carried out according to wise law.

The long dialogue between Cyrus and his father reveals Xenophon’s requirement of an ideal leader. He must be actually wise instead of seeming to be wise (Xen. Cyr. 1.6.22); he must ‘learn all that it is possible to acquire by learning’ (Xen. Cyr. 1.6.23); he must surpass every one of his followers in endurance (Xen.

²³² Newell (1983), 890-891.

²³³ Johnson (2005), 203.

²³⁴ Whidden (2007), 540.

²³⁵ Whidden (2007), 561-562.

²³⁶ Whidden (2007), 549-550.

²³⁷ Whidden (2007), 567.

Cyr. 1.6.25); and he must keep learning new experiences from history, from other wise men, and other states all his life (*Xen. Cyr.* 1.6.44-46). In order to become a competent leader, Cyrus made great efforts to improve himself. For example, during the conquest, Cyrus paid great attention and spent lots of time to make sure he can remember the names of all his followers, so that the generals and soldiers are all surprised at the good memory Cyrus showed when he called everyone by name as he assigned them their places and gave them their instructions, and therefore become more loyal to Cyrus (*Xen. Cyr.* 5.3.46-51). As Deborah Gera observes, the image of Cyrus is ‘virtually omnipresent in the *Cyropaedia*’,²³⁸ and his plans were always accepted willingly by his subjects without any opposition.²³⁹ In fact, for Xenophon’s purpose, only Cyrus the Great himself is indispensable for the task of education. Hundreds of persons appear in the *Cyropaedia*, yet only about ten of them play active roles in Xenophon’s narrative.²⁴⁰ Others seem to be no more than the shadows and echoes of Cyrus’ will. And among those few persons playing active parts, only one figure called Cyaxares, the uncle of Cyrus, appears frequently throughout the whole work. Yet this man is the only member of Cyrus’ family who is not a historical character.²⁴¹ He is fictional and therefore not indispensable. He only serves as a representative of Cyrus’ personal will, helps to carry out Cyrus’ education, but is by no means its ultimate foundation.

What is more, the quality of ideal leader is not only achieved by hard learning and working; the leader himself must be an inborn talent and even holy. According to Xenophon’s narrative, when some Armenians went home after meeting with Cyrus, ‘they talked, one of Cyrus’ wisdom, another of his strength, another of his gentleness, and still another of his beauty and his commanding presence.’ (*Xen. Cyr.* 3.1.41) The charisma of Cyrus the Great is everlasting. Because ‘even to this day the barbarians tell in story and in song that Cyrus was most handsome in person, most generous of

²³⁸ Gera (1993), 280.

²³⁹ Gera (1993), 282.

²⁴⁰ Due (1989), 53.

²⁴¹ Due (1989), 55.

heart, most devoted to learning, and most ambitious, so that he endured all sorts of labour and faced all sorts of danger for the sake of praise' (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.2.1). He even possessed the supernatural ability to interpret the will of gods and therefore predicted his own death in advance (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.7.2). Only such an ideal king and almost an 'Übermensch' can undertake the holy task of implanting values such like justice, gratitude, self-control, endurance and obedience, which he has already possessed himself since childhood, in his friends and soldiers and everyone around him.²⁴² On the one hand, in our eyes, the superhuman character of Cyrus the Great makes Xenophon's proposal of social reformation even harder to practise (for such kind of ideal heroes is not available anywhere in reality); on the other hand, in Xenophon's time and according to his description of Socrates, the existence of such figures is both credible and desirable.

Nevertheless, at the same time we must keep in mind that Cyrus the Great is not a tyrant; or at least Xenophon does not wish to depict him as an absolute monarch regardless of law. Here I would argue that in ancient Greek thought law (νόμος) comes from both gods and men, both ancestral customs and contemporary regulations.²⁴³ In fact, in the *Works and Days*, one of the earliest ancient Greek works mentioning νόμος, Hesiod tells us that at first it is exactly Zeus who gives νόμος to human beings (Hes. *Op.* 276-280.). In his classical work, *Nomos and the Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy*, Martin Ostwald summarises thirteen senses of νόμος used in extant ancient Greek corpus,²⁴⁴ and confirms that it contains a religious sense from very early age.²⁴⁵ What is more, in Xenophon's context, the will of gods stands above the authority of secular laws. For instance, in the *Spartan Constitution*, all laws made by Lycurgus must be sent to Delphi for consultment before their publishment (Xen. *Lac.* 8.5). And the economic proposal of Xenophon himself in his *Poroi* should also be sent to Dodona and Delphi for the gods' opinion

²⁴² Due (1989), 106.

²⁴³ Liddell and Scott (1996), 1180.

²⁴⁴ Ostwald (1969), 20-54.

²⁴⁵ Ostwald (1969), 40.

(Xen. *Vect.* 6.2). In that case, we can safely conclude that the pious Cyrus must be a good king who obeys divine νόμος in Xenophon's eyes.

First of all, the *Cyropaedia* indicates frequently that Cyrus did show great respect to the laws of gods so that one early translator of the book, Maurice Ashley even believed that the *Cyropaedia* was on religious education.²⁴⁶ In the *Cyropaedia*, the first thing Cyrus did before taking any important action was always to consult the gods and offer sacrifice (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.5.6; 6.2.40). After the capture of Babylon, Cyrus immediately called the magi and requested them to select sanctuaries and the first fruits of the booty for the gods (Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.35). He showed his new subjects that he respected the will of god and the order of magi; and he 'never failed to sing hymns to the gods at daybreak and to sacrifice daily to whatsoever deities the magi directed' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.23). In these passages Xenophon mainly praises Cyrus' piety, but every reader would understand clearly that such a pious man must respect the law of gods and the admonition of magi perfectly well.

In the second place, Cyrus also does not always neglect secular laws. The very source of Cyrus' reign, the power of his father was strictly under the control of law. Although his father made himself 'master of everything in Media', still 'equality of rights is considered justice' in Persia (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.3.18). Cyrus' father was 'the first one to do what is ordered by the State and to accept what is decreed, and his standard is not his will but the law' (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.3.18). As a matter of fact, Cyrus not only respected the established law, but also tried to improve his own virtue so that his character would be identical to law.²⁴⁷ In his mind, a good ruler should become 'a law with eyes' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.21-22). And before his death, Cyrus also admonished his children, '... take what I say, therefore, as that which is approved by time, by custom, and by law' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.7.10). The evidence clearly shows that Cyrus'

²⁴⁶ Tatum (1989), 31.

²⁴⁷ In my view, this idea is evident and predominant in the *Cyropaedia* and Xen. *Hier.* 11.11-15. Instead of making his own power absolute, an ideal political leader should ensure that his personal behaviour meets the requirement of established laws and the public expectation, in order to persuade and educate his subjects to follow the same legal regulations and common moral standard. The view that Xenophon's heroes transcend the rule of law misunderstands the author's original intention.

education did not go against established laws at all. On the contrary, they are always consistent and sometimes identical; and we can suppose that some of Cyrus the Great's teaching in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* must be derived from the requirement of laws of both gods and ancestral traditions in historical time.²⁴⁸

In contrast to the *Cyropaedia*, the focus of the *Spartan Constitution* is the positive effects of established laws on the Spartan people (Xen. *Lac.* 8.1-5), which is different from the case in Xenophon's Persian Kingdom. But it is quite easy to recognise that Lycurgus, a leader very similar to the image of Cyrus, always stands behind and operates the whole system. In the opening part Xenophon points out the achievement and contribution of Lycurgus rather straightforwardly:

Once when I was pondering on the fact that Sparta, though having one of the smallest populations, became the most powerful and famous city in Greece, I wondered how this could have happened. However, once I had studied the institutions of the Spartans, I wondered no more. Indeed I admire Lycurgus, who gave the Spartans the laws in obedience to which they were outstandingly successful, and I regard him as an extremely wise man. For, not only did he not imitate the other cities, but by adopting customs quite different from the majority, he made his own native city exceedingly prosperous. (Xen. *Lac.* 1.1-2)

Therefore, Lycurgus played a very similar role in Sparta as Cyrus did in the Persian Empire. And he is the very creator and initiator of all the wise laws and institutions to be introduced in the rest of the work. Lycurgus also resembles Cyrus in keeping harmony with the officers around him. Cyrus' soldiers obeyed him without reservation; and in Sparta the Ephors exchange oaths on behalf of state with the king (Xen. *Lac.* 15.7-8). Lycurgus and other competent kings in Sparta were also to some

²⁴⁸ In classical scholarship, there is a tendency to deny absolutely the historicity of everything Xenophon incorporates in his *Cyropaedia* (Hirsch (1985), 61-62). However, as Steven W. Hirsch points out, it is unthinkable that Xenophon would bother himself to make up so much detailed information of Persia, in which some can be well attested by external evidence (Hirsch (1985), 63). In my opinion, Xenophon must know well from his experience and historical study that Persian ideology adorns divine and human laws very much, therefore it is unsuitable to suppose that Xenophon would depict his hero Cyrus as a tyrant totally regardless of laws.

extent supernatural because they were honoured in their funerals as demigods (Xen. *Lac.* 15.9).

In sum, the essence of government represented in the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution* are almost identical. In the former, Cyrus the Great, an ideal king, accomplishes the task of the moral education of the whole society according to wise laws; in the latter, Lycurgus, a great legislator, regulates the behaviour of Spartan people and maintains the political stability and social morality through the laws he made himself. Yet both systems decayed and collapsed after the deaths of their creators.

h. Differences

In his article ‘Xenophon, Sparta and the *Cyropaedia*’, Christopher Tuplin compares the images of Sparta and Persia in most of Xenophon’s extant works and finds out that these two images shares very little similarities in his *Memorabilia*,²⁴⁹ *Symposium*²⁵⁰ and *Agesilaus*;²⁵¹ while direct comparisons of the two are very few.²⁵² Nevertheless, as our analysis shows, the contents of the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution* share high similarity. Yet certain differences do exist. One major distinction is the attitude towards reward and punishment.

Rewarding friends is one important means for moral education in the *Cyropaedia*. Cyrus the Great believed that ‘the duties of a good shepherd and of a good king are much alike’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.14). A good shepherd should make his flocks happy; therefore a good king should do the same for his people. In that consideration Cyrus ‘was ambitious to surpass all other men in attention to his friends’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.14). What is more, the rewards are not arbitrarily given, but with a clear sense of education. Xenophon explains that Cyrus believed ‘if he always

²⁴⁹ Tuplin (1994), 128.

²⁵⁰ Tuplin (1994), 128.

²⁵¹ Tuplin (1994), 132-133.

²⁵² Tuplin (1994), 132.

paid scrupulous regard to what was upright, others also, he thought, would be more likely to abstain from improper gains and to endeavour to make their way by upright methods' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.26). That is also the best way to inspire others to respect virtue and refrain themselves from doing anything improper (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.27) as well as keep his subjects being obedient to him (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.29). The result was that 'each strives to appear as deserving as he could in the eyes of Cyrus' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.39).

On the other hand, in Xenophon's Sparta, the same result is achieved by the opposite method, namely the severe punishment. For example, a coward would be looked down upon and even humiliated in almost all public situations. In a wrestling bout nobody wishes to be matched with him; in a chorus he is banished to the ignominious place; in the streets he must make way to others; in a banquet he should give his seat up even to a junior. If the coward does not do all these things, 'he must submit to be beaten by his betters' (Xen. *Lac.* 9.4-5). According to the report of Xenophon, Lycurgus was so severe that he not only punished people who did wrong, but also made penalties to the ones who neglected to live as good a life as possible (Xen. *Lac.* 10.5).

Here we observe a sharp contrast. Actually the reward of Cyrus is extremely lavish. He rewarded his followers with 'gifts and positions of authority and seats of honour and all sorts of preferment' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.39), so that 'though he far exceeded all other men in the amount of the revenues he received, yet he excelled still more in the quantity of presents he made' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.7). However, in the world depicted in the *Spartan Constitution*, such rewards and wastes of wealth are not tolerable. Lycurgus even forbade freeborn citizens to have anything to do with business affairs and kept them living in thrift (Xen. *Lac.* 7.1-2). On the other hand, punishment as one means of education is mentioned in the *Cyropaedia* on only one or two occasions (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.17-18), and it is never as important there as in the Spartan system.

Another evident difference is that the understanding of the Greek term παιδεία seems to be quite different. In the *Spartan Constitution*, παιδεία seems to be chiefly adopted for children and youths following its traditional usage in ancient Greek cultural context; while in the *Cyropaedia*, as we will see soon in the following passages, παιδεία covers all one's life and influences him or her from birth till death.

Tuplin lists other potential differences between Cyrus' Persia and Lycurgus' Sparta in his paper, for instance the absence of the eccentric character of Sparta in Cyrus' empire.²⁵³ In my opinion, these and similar slight divergences are quite understandable. After all, Xenophon did not produce everything in these two works out of his imagination, as Nadon supposes for the *Cyropaedia* (who names the whole work 'a political theory');²⁵⁴ and he never intends to advocate Sparta under a guise of an fictional Persia.²⁵⁵ Of course the political and educational systems of Sparta and Persia are different and Xenophon's Greek readers must know that well. Therefore Xenophon had to respect historical truth and sacrifice his own utopian thought system, though in more occasions he did take advantage of the distance in time and space of the two states he chose to write about to obtain for himself a certain amount of freedom in composition.²⁵⁶ And in the case of divergence of the usage of παιδεία, it might be relevant to the composing consequence or intended audience of these two works, which is almost totally unknown for modern readers. Generally speaking, the similarity of contents in the *Cyropaedia* (on education) and the *Spartan Constitution* (on political structure) is predominant and striking; while their difference is secondary, marginal and relatively easy to explain. These similar features are not simply produced by the resemblance between Persia and Sparta as 'natural pairs'²⁵⁷ in Xenophon's mind (as similar feature is not evident in other works of Xenophon's corpus), but highly relevant to the close relationship between

²⁵³ Tuplin (1994), 138-139.

²⁵⁴ Nadon (2001), 1.

²⁵⁵ Tuplin (1994), 135.

²⁵⁶ Due (1989), 22.

²⁵⁷ Tuplin (1994), 137-138. Another instance of parallel comparison of Lycurgus and Cyrus appears in Pl. *Ep.* 4, 320d (but the text's authenticity is highly suspected).

ideal educational system and successful political regime in Xenophon's concept.

On the other hand, we have to admit that the scope of the *Cyropaedia* is much broader than the *Spartan Constitution*. It talks about the romance of Panthea (Xen. Cyr. 4.6.11-7.3.16), experiences in hunting (Xen. Cyr. 1.4.8), military techniques (Xen. Cyr. 8.8.24), social manners in symposiums (Xen. Cyr. 4.5.4-8) — in brief, almost any collective behaviour performed in public. In conclusion, the *Cyropaedia* is an ambitious and huge work which contains all crucial topics Xenophon wishes to discuss in his *Spartan Constitution* in details and also goes far beyond that.

III. Xenophon's Concept of Social Education

Of course, it should not be unexpected when we find that two works by the same writer show common features in logic, opinion and literary style. Yet when the analysis above seems to suggest that the *Cyropaedia* and Xenophon's work on πολιτεία, the *Spartan Constitution* do share a lot of things in common, the phenomenon turns out to be noteworthy and even surprising. Since the Roman Age, many writers have attempted to understand the *Cyropaedia* as a work on political constitution. Apart from Cicero's letter to his brother cited above, Diogenes Laertius also describes Plato and Xenophon as rivals on the same subjects (Diog. Laert. 3.34), and the *Cyropaedia* is compared by him with Plato's *Republic*. And Gellius suggests that it is Xenophon's critical response to the *Republic* (Gell. NA. 14.3.1-4). Though Diogenes Laertius' detailed description may be produced by later imagination, the political intention of Xenophon in this work presented by ancient critics can be partly historical. Among modern researchers, Bodil Due believes that 'Xenophon's subject is the art of ruling or the relations between a ruler and his subjects'.²⁵⁸ In my opinion, Bodil Due's observation is very close to truth but still incomplete. Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* is a work on education, exactly as its title shows.

²⁵⁸ Due (1989), 207.

There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of the Greek title Κύρου Παιδεία, as it appears in all manuscripts preserved and in Diogenes Laertius' biography of Xenophon (Diog. Laert. 2.56). Still, Breitenbach argues that only Book I suits well for the title;²⁵⁹ And Deborah Gera even believes that no passages except for 1.6.1-2.1.1 have anything to do with Cyrus' education at all.²⁶⁰ However, in 1973, W.E. Higgins rightly observes:

The entire life of Cyrus represents an ideal of action. Criticism that *Kyroupaideia* (*Cyropaedia*) is a misleading title, since only its first book concerns Cyrus' education, thus misses Xenophon's point, namely, that a proper *paideia* is an on-going process in which certain things are learned and done at certain times in accordance with the ability of an increasing maturity. It is decidedly not mere instruction for the young, if only because Xenophon sees no point at which a man can say he is finished with learning.²⁶¹

Bodil Due also points out that such opinion misunderstands Xenophon, who actually uses the term of education in a wider sense.²⁶² My opinion is that Xenophon does use παιδεία in a wider sense, but the sense is actually even wider than what W.E. Higgins and Bodil Due supposed it to be.

First of all, the education Xenophon describes is a lifelong obligation. In the first book of the *Cyropaedia* he presents for us the Persian mode of education. In Persia, education is not a privilege or investment enjoyed by a minority, but something obliged by the force of law (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.2-3). There is a special place for such education, which is called ἐλεύθερα ἀγορά (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.3). According to Xenophon, 'this agora [enclosing the government buildings] is divided into four parts; one of these belongs to the boys, one to the youths, another to the men of mature years, and another to those who are past the age of military service (διήρηται δὲ αὕτη ἡ ἀγορὰ [ἢ περὶ τὰ ἀρχεῖα] τέτταρα μέρη· τούτων δ' ἔστιν ἓν μὲν παισίν, ἓν δὲ

²⁵⁹ Due (1989), 15.

²⁶⁰ Gera (1993), 50.

²⁶¹ Higgins (1973), 54.

²⁶² Due (1989), 15.

ἐφήβοις, ἄλλο τελείοις ἀνδράσιν, ἄλλο τοῖς ὑπὲρ τὰ στρατεύσιμα ἔτη γεγονόσι)’ (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.4). The law requires everyone to come daily to their quarter of the agora to receive education (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.4). Each division is charged by twelve officers selected from the twelve Persian tribes (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.5). Boys learn justice and self-control there (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.6-8). When they are sixteen or seventeen years old, they are transferred to the quarter for youths (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.8). The tasks assigned to youths are to guard the city and to develop their powers of self-control (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.9). The officials of boys and youths would both be praised and honoured when their students win prizes in contests for youths (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.12). After another ten years they join the group of mature men and serve the army (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.12-13). When they are around fifty years old, they become ‘elders’ and take charge of trying all sorts of public and private cases (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.13-14).

It is easy for us to recognise that this type of education is quite alien to modern concept and is also very different from philosophical education in classical Athens.²⁶³ It goes on all through life²⁶⁴ and it is performed most of the time beyond the classroom. I prefer to term this kind of activity as ‘social education’, as it is a lifelong task and touches almost every branch of public life. Therefore it is much easier for us to understand why the *Cyropaedia* is a work on education. What Xenophon discusses here is not education in the narrow sense, but one kind of social education based and improved from the Persian prototype described above.

In the second place, Xenophon’s social education must be carried out by an ideal political leader. That is why he chooses to write about Cyrus the Great, for he was the most successful in ‘governing men’ (Xen. Cyr. 1.1.6). In spite of that, Xenophon does not describe fully every detail of Cyrus’ life, but only selects what Plutarch later calls ‘signs (σημεῖα)’, like ancient writers of moral biographies often do.²⁶⁵ In that sense, almost everything presented in the *Cyropaedia* suits the purpose

²⁶³ Reisert (2009), 313.

²⁶⁴ Higgins (1973), 46; Due (1989), 15.

²⁶⁵ Tatum (1989), 102.

of the author perfectly well.²⁶⁶ In Xenophon's logic, as the nature of his education is public and social, only competent political leaders with perfect character and even supernatural talent, for example Cyrus the Great and Lycurgus, do have the responsibility, ability and enough power to carry it out. The content of this type of education is largely political; and the most important aim of a successful political constitution is to fulfil Xenophon's idea of social education. That is exactly why we would find the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution* share so much in common.

Last but not least, as a Socratic philosopher, the ultimate aim of Xenophon is the elevation of morality in the whole society. In my opinion, that is something important which Bodil Due fails to explain satisfactorily. Xenophon does not simply wish to provide some technical advice to a certain monarch or a manual on the art of government for politicians and generals. His final purpose is to establish one kind of perfect and original²⁶⁷ morality by his education throughout the society. Therefore, the *Cyropaedia* is by no means a practical guide or pamphlet written for politicians. In this work Xenophon pays no attention to the art of collecting tax, managing public finance, trading with other states, choosing and examining subordinate officers, or how to raise good horses and produce powerful weapons. As a general and statesman himself, Xenophon must know clearly that these affairs are also crucial for practical management of leadership. But those things have little to do with his social education, and are even not key points in the functions of his ideal political constitution. On the other hand, something not strictly political is relevant to social education, for example the nature of love and friendship, the proper manners in symposium, and the sacred ceremony to gods; because these affairs serve the improvement of people's morality. That is why the *Cyropaedia* covers most main points of the *Spartan Constitution* and sometimes goes beyond that. The reason is that the requirement of Xenophon's social education covers and goes beyond the sphere of politics.

²⁶⁶ Tatum (1989), 146.

²⁶⁷ Seager (2001), 391.

Of course, such an ambitious aim is not easy to achieve, as Xenophon points out himself in the introduction of the *Cyropaedia*:

The thought once occurred to us that how many democratic governments have been overthrown by people who preferred to live under any constitution other than democracy, and again, how many monarchies and how many oligarchies in times past have been abolished by the people. We reflected, moreover, how many of those individuals who have aspired to absolute power have either been quickly deposed once for all; or if they hold their power, no matter for how short a time, they are objects of wonder as having proved to be wise and happy men. Then, too, we thought we had observed that even in private houses some people who had rather more than the usual number of servants and some also who had only a very few were quite unable to assert their authority over even those few, though nominally they are masters.

Beyond that, we also reflected that cowherds are the rulers of their cattle, that grooms are the rulers of their horses, and that all herdsmen might properly be regarded as the rulers of the animals over which they are placed in charge. Now we noticed, as we thought, that all these herds obeyed their keepers more readily than men obey their rulers. For the herds go wherever their keeper directs them and graze in those places to which he leads them and keeps out of those from which he excludes them. Moreover, they allow their keeper to enjoy the profits that accrue from them as he wishes. And then again, we have never known of a herd conspiring against its keeper, either to refuse obedience to him or to deny him the privilege of enjoying the profits. At the same time, herds are more intractable to strangers than to their rulers and those who derive profit from them. However, men are more ready to conspire against those whom they see attempting to rule over them than against anyone. Thus, as we meditated on this analogy, we were inclined to conclude that it is easier for men to rule over any and all other creatures than to rule over human beings. (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.1.1-3)

In my opinion, this passage offers an invaluable clue for us to understand the general intention of the composition of the *Cyropaedia*. It is a work on moral education as well as on political leadership,²⁶⁸ and there is no wonder that ancient readers would compare it with Plato's *Republic*, as they do treat very similar subjects. The analogy of herdmen adopted here also reminds us the metaphor of the shepherd in Plato's *Republic* 343b-345e, though the latter discusses justice of leadership instead of difficulty of government.²⁶⁹ In Xenophon's view, it is more difficult to govern men than to rule any other creatures. That is not because the multitude has more physical strength than animals or their leaders, but because people have their own free wills and tend to rebel against any authority imposed on them. The ultimate solution of that can be only moral and philosophical. And Cyrus managed to accomplish that task. Xenophon reports that 'by setting such an example Cyrus secured at court great correctness of conduct on the part of his subordinates, who gave precedence to their superiors; and thus he also secured from them a great degree of respect and politeness towards one another. And among them you would never have detected anyone raising his voice in anger or giving vent to his delight in boisterous laughter; but on seeing them you would have judged that they were in truth making a noble life their aim.' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.33) For Persian subjects, Cyrus the Great was not only their ruler, but their father; 'for that name obviously belongs to a benefactor rather than to a despoiler' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.9). Finally, it is quite impressive that the pessimistic mood expressed in the introduction is successfully reverted when we read the view of Pheraulas. In his opinion, man is 'the best and most grateful of all creatures, since he saw that when people are praised by anyone they are very glad to praise him in turn; and when anyone does them a favour, they try to do him one in return; when they recognise that anyone is kindly disposed toward them they return his good-will; and when they know that anyone loves them

²⁶⁸ Sandridge (2012), 119.

²⁶⁹ For further discussion on the metaphor of shepherd, see Brock (2013), 143-153.

they cannot dislike him; and he noticed especially that they strive more earnestly than any other creature to return the loving care of parents both during their parents' life-time and after their death; whereas he knew that all other creatures were both more thankless and more unfeeling than man.' (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.3.49) In sum, it is not a bad thing that every subject has his own free will as long as human nature is kind and grateful. What is important is that the ruler should know how to direct their minds to a rational, peaceful and honest status. That is the achievement of the fictional Cyrus the Great. And it is also the utopian dream of the philosopher Xenophon.

IV. Origin of Xenophon's Educational Idea: Life Experience Reflected in His Other Major Works

In the literature of classical period, the image of ideal kingship is nothing uncommon. Evagoras in Isocrates' prose encomium *Evagoras*, Theseus in Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, and Hiero in Simonides and Bacchylides' odes are all highly idealised lawful kings. Nevertheless, in that time, it seems that only Plato and Xenophon,²⁷⁰ two followers of Socrates, are so ambitious as to suggest that one perfect political leader can undertake the huge burden of moral education of the whole society. As we have seen, the ideal image of Cyrus the Great, a perfect political leader, plays the decisive role in the procession of Xenophon's social education. He initiated and maintained the whole system of education; and the system fell apart with his death. Then what is the prototype of this figure? Is it really drawn from Persian historical documents and oral tradition, or simply copied and stolen from the image of philosopher king depicted by his 'rival' Plato in *Republic*?

Maybe the date of the composition of the *Cyropaedia* can provide some clues for us to answer the question. Unlike most of Xenophon's other writings, we can

²⁷⁰ It seems that Aeschines of Sphettus (Aeschines Socraticus, fr. 33 (in Giannantoni)) and Antisthenes (Antisthenes, fr. 141 (= Athen. v 330c, in Giannantoni)) also wrote something about Cyrus. But its content and whether it is about ideal leadership is unknown.

roughly date the composition of the *Cyropaedia*. Most scholars have agreed that it is written in the 360s²⁷¹ (about twenty years after the composition of Plato's *Republic*, with which it shares a lot of common features in ancient readers' eyes (Gell. *NA*. 14.3.1-4)) in the last years of Xenophon's life.²⁷² In that case, it is plausible to argue that Xenophon might be inspired by Plato's *Republic* in some way. Nevertheless, I believe that the image of Cyrus the Great must also partly come from life experience of Xenophon himself, and it serves as a conclusion of Xenophon's reflection on contemporary history and his personal successes and failures.

In perhaps one of his earliest works, the *Anabasis*,²⁷³ Xenophon introduces for us his leader, Cyrus the Younger, who perhaps serves as the first prototype of his remote ancestor, as Deborah Gera believes.²⁷⁴ In Xenophon's view, Cyrus the Younger was a man 'who was the most kingly and the most worthy to rule of all the Persians who have been born since Cyrus the Elder' (Xen. *An.* 1.9.1). He was outstanding in many aspects ever since childhood (Xen. *An.* 1.9.2). He showed himself pre-eminent in his attentions to all his friends to make them devoted to himself (Xen. *An.* 1.9.20). He distributed gifts generously as Cyrus the Great did in the *Cyropaedia* (Xen. *An.* 1.9.23).

Another prototype of Cyrus is Jason of Pherae,²⁷⁵ a tyrant appearing in Xenophon's *Hellenica*. We are certain that Xenophon must be familiar with his deeds and believe that this figure was important in Greek history, as he pays great attention to him in his *Hellenica* (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.4-9; 6.4.20-37). This tyrant had great power and enjoyed glorious fame (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.4). He was strong in body and a lover of toil (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.5-6). He rewarded his friends lavishly (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.6). He preferred to win his enemies to his side by their willingness (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.7). He compared himself to the King of Persians and Agesilaus and considered himself to

²⁷¹ Gera (1993), 23.

²⁷² Anderson (1974), 2.

²⁷³ Due (1989), 205.

²⁷⁴ Gera (1993), 11.

²⁷⁵ Due (1989), 186.

surpass them (Xen. *Hell.* 6.1.12). By his numerous allies Jason became the greatest man of his time and was not lightly to be despised by anyone (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.28). And he was also pious to Apollo (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.29-30), as Cyrus did to Persian gods and magi.

A third prototype of Cyrus again comes from the *Anabasis*, which is Xenophon himself. When the leaders of the Greek mercenaries were seized and executed, and the rest of the frustrated soldiers were left in the central area of the Persian Empire, far away from their hometown (Xen. *An.* 3.1.2), Xenophon received a holy dream (Xen. *An.* 3.1.11-12) and decided to lead other men in the long march. By overseeing military discipline, obeying the will of gods (Xen. *An.* 3.1.38-44), emphasising the importance of obedience and encouraging the spirit of Greek soldiers (Xen. *An.* 3.2.30-31), Xenophon managed to bring his fellows out of danger and accomplished a miracle in ancient military history. His methods are sometimes very similar to those Cyrus the Great adopted.²⁷⁶

The final figure moulding the shape of Cyrus is Xenophon's teacher Socrates. In this aspect Debora Gera has already done detailed and excellent research. She points out that Socrates is a real presence in the *Cyropaedia*.²⁷⁷ He and Cyrus share common personal traits; certain events in the *Cyropaedia* relates to Socrates' trial and final days;²⁷⁸ and the conversation between Cyrus and Chrysantas is very similar to dialogues in the *Memorabilia*.²⁷⁹

In sum, the image of Cyrus the Great comes from the most important acquaintances of Xenophon himself, and it might also be based on and further developed from some Socratic traditions, for example Plato's idea of philosopher king in his *Republic*. The *Cyropaedia* is a summary of Xenophon's philosophical

²⁷⁶ Besides, some elements of the *Cyropaedia* may come directly from Xenophon's military experience as a general, for example the importance of gods' favour (Xen. *Cyr.* 4.1.6 and *Eq. mag.* 1.1) and general (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.6.22-51 and *Eq. mag.* 2.5) in battles and the indispensibility of order (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.14-15 and *Eq. mag.* 1.15) and rewarding (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.14 and *Eq. mag.* 2.6).

²⁷⁷ Gera (1993), 26.

²⁷⁸ Gera (1993), 27.

²⁷⁹ Gera (1993), 115.

system as well as his life experience composed in his old age. As a ‘world citizen’ of his age²⁸⁰ who was born in Athens but spent thirty-six years in exile and used to travel to Persia, Sparta, Elis and Corinth,²⁸¹ Xenophon preserves his life-long experience and his reflection of the best possible political organisation and social education in his longest extant work, the *Cyropaedia*.

V. Conclusion

The *Cyropaedia* is one work very similar in appearance to the genre of πολιτεία literature. But the real subject of it is social education. This kind of education is applicable to people of all different age groups and every branch of public life. The key figure to ensure the success of social education is an ideal political leader; in the case of the *Cyropaedia* that is Cyrus the Great, a perfect image mainly abstracted from Xenophon’s own life experience. And the ultimate aim of the education is the elevation and improvement of morality of the whole society in a philosophical sense.

Therefore, the *Cyropaedia* is by no means a minor work²⁸² or simply a story told for entertainment, though its influence on Hellenistic novels cannot be overestimated.²⁸³ Its subject is both important and serious. It concludes the experience and thought of Xenophon in his last years.

Unlike Plato’s philosopher king, the fictional Cyrus the Great is a man of action.²⁸⁴ He made mistakes in childhood occasionally but managed to achieve all virtues by learning; he conquered and educated his subjects; he even possessed supernatural ability to interpret the will of gods; and he played tricks when it was necessary (Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.37-40; 8.1.17-20; 8.2.10-12). His success is based on his military victories and his control of political power. On the other hand, this ideal

²⁸⁰ Ferguson (1975), 56.

²⁸¹ Delebecque (1957), 499.

²⁸² Tatum (1989), 40.

²⁸³ Reichel (2010), 438.

²⁸⁴ Due (1989), 184.

leader is first and foremost a virtuous and ethical man.²⁸⁵ The final purpose of his education is both moral and philosophical.²⁸⁶ All political, military, household leaders can benefit themselves by learning from his example.²⁸⁷ He provides everything Ischomachus desires in *Oeconomicus*; he would succeed where Cyrus the Younger, Agesilaus and Epaminondas were defeated in reality;²⁸⁸ he would educate the jury which put Socrates to death. In sum, 'he would transform his world, rather than be destroyed by it'.²⁸⁹

Nevertheless, in contrast to Plato as well as other utopian thinkers in later ages, Xenophon never dreamed that his models of Persian education and Spartan constitution would be everlasting. He does not bother himself to solve the difficulty which no monarchy before and after his time ever managed to settle. When a great king dies and is succeeded by somebody incompetent, when a good constitution enjoys too much glory and success and turns to be corrupted and conservative, the magnificent empire or perfect system declines and finally falls apart. In the same manner, when Xenophon's Cyrus and Lycurgus die, the systems they set up with great effort cease to exist.²⁹⁰ Christopher Nadon concludes that Xenophon did see himself the weakness of all ancient political life²⁹¹ and the limitation of every existing regime in his time.²⁹² It might be too arbitrary to suppose Xenophon would have such a profound idea more than two thousand years ago. But in any case, as a general and statesman himself, Xenophon does have more practical considerations for his model of Utopia, as we shall see in later chapters.

²⁸⁵ Due (1989), 19.

²⁸⁶ Tamiolaki, (2012), 563.

²⁸⁷ Carlier (2010), 330.

²⁸⁸ Tatum (1989), 58.

²⁸⁹ Tatum (1989), 58.

²⁹⁰ In scholarship, Pl. *Leg.* 694c-696b is sometimes taken as a response to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*. Nevertheless, even if that supposition is true (for which we are in short of decisive evidence), Plato's critique is not to the point. From a historical and realistic perspective, Xenophon sees clearly that however powerful a hegemony is, it must suffer its decline in due time. This phenomenon only reflects the everlasting rule of human society and history, but has nothing to do with a monarch's family education of his children (which only comprises a very some proportion in the social education in Xenophon's own context). In that sense, Xenophon's vision of human politics, while far less philosophical than that of Plato, is relatively broader and less utopian (though not necessary to be practical, either) than the latter.

²⁹¹ Nadon (2001), 164.

²⁹² Nadon (2001), 178.

Chapter 2: Xenophon's *Hiero*: A Rhetorical Dialogue to Persuade the Organiser of Social Education

I. Two Problems Remaining in the Utopian Model of the *Cyropaedia*

As the chapter above indicates, Xenophon presents for us in the *Cyropaedia* a mature and systematic theory of social education. It is carried out by an ideal leader. Its contents are mainly political, while the ultimate aim of the system remains moral and philosophical. Nevertheless, like most utopian models of social organisation, there are still two serious problems remaining unsolved in Xenophon's *magnum opus*. And Xenophon must face the challenge of them if he does wish to transplant philosophical education of Socratic mode into social education and the political sphere.

First of all, for the teaching of Socrates and almost all kinds of modern school education, the idea and practice are integrated in the teacher himself. A teacher gives instruction to students because that is his/her work and what his/her students, as well as other people in the society, expect him/her to do. But social education in Xenophon's context is quite different. The very idea of it is produced by Xenophon, a moralist and writer in his last years, but he himself was never a chief political leader except during the retreat of his army from Persia after Cyrus the Younger's unsuccessful expedition (and even at that time his power was far from absolute and had to be shared with other generals). In that case, the social education of Xenophon's type must be devised by a wise philosopher and carried out by an absolute political leader, who is powerful and courageous enough to make laws, carry out reformation, secure public order, defeat brutal enemies and punish unruly mobs; while at the same time he must be modest and rational enough to give his ears to the philosopher and follow his instructions willingly. This seems to be a very difficult and complex task which even some outstanding thinkers in both ancient and

modern ages, including Plato in Syracuse and Thomas More in England, failed to accomplish in practice. In the reality, a competent politician often finds that a philosophical and utopian proposal useless or difficult to put into practice.

In the second place, school education is carried out in a certain classroom. In the context of Socratic education, the ‘classroom’ might be the *agora* of Athens, one friend’s home, a hall for symposium or a court for lawsuit. But in any case, such places offer an enclosed space in which security, social manner, order and discipline can be respected and protected. On the other hand, Socrates could choose his own ‘students’ and he would not bother himself to educate anyone who was without talent in philosophy or without positive interest in knowledge and wisdom (though Critias and Alcibiades (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.14-16) might be two exceptions); and in many situations, these people would come to Socrates for knowledge initiatives (Pl. *Resp.* 357a; Xen. *Mem.* 4.8.11.). Therefore, the order and discipline of Socratic education can be secured from the very beginning without compulsory means.²⁹³ However, generally speaking, a political leader cannot choose his subjects. He must meet and deal with selfish and deceitful ministers, vulgar and agitated mobs, as well as harsh and hostile enemies. As a result, in order to maintain the public order and build up his personal authority so as to control his subjects and to create a satisfactory environment in which social education of morality can be carried out successfully, the ideal political leader needs many more skills beyond moral admonition and mastery of academic principles.

In the discussion of the two crucial problems, Xenophon displays his talent as a first-class classical Greek writer as well as his distinctive identity in comparison to all his contemporary thinkers, for example Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle. The second and third chapters of this part are devoted respectively to the discussions of those two problems, starting with the most particular and brilliant dialogue ever composed by Xenophon, the *Hiero*.

²⁹³ Kojève (1963b), 217.

II. Rhetorical and Persuasive Nature of the *Hiero*

a. Disputation on the Nature of the *Hiero*

The *Hiero*, which depicts a conversation between Hiero the tyrant and Simonides the poet on the misfortune of tyrants and happiness of good kings, is an excellent and attractive dialogue written by Xenophon.²⁹⁴ Nevertheless, the study of this work is also very difficult and rather tricky, as academic opinions on the very essence of the *Hiero*, including the definition of it as a dialogue, remain diverse, controversial, and undecided up to now. The focus of the disagreement lies in the different understandings of the obvious ‘change of roles’ appearing in this enigmatic dialogue.

According to V.J. Gray, the *Hiero* seems to be a typical Socratic dialogue written by Xenophon, a disciple of Socrates like Plato; and the work itself should be taken as a response to Plato’s *Laws*, 710d.²⁹⁵ She believes that Simonides plays the role of Socrates in the *Hiero* and she tries to attribute Socratic irony to Simonides, in order to explain dramatic change of roles of him from a listener showing hardly any wisdom in the first half of the dialogue to an eloquent teacher in the second half.²⁹⁶ In her opinion, Simonides pretends to know nothing in the beginning to test the knowledge of Hiero, and afterwards shows his own wisdom and gives advice to the tyrant. In that sense, the *Hiero* depicts a standard scene of the meeting between the wise and the powerful.²⁹⁷ But even Gray herself has to admit Simonides’ method seems to be quite odd and very different from Socratic irony. In fact, during the most parts of the conversation it is ‘Simonides’ own knowledge that appears to be tested’.²⁹⁸ And in her recent work entitled *Xenophon’s Mirror of Princes*, which is

²⁹⁴ Ferguson (1975), 57.

²⁹⁵ Gray (2007), 30.

²⁹⁶ Gray (2007), 36-37.

²⁹⁷ Gray (2007), 31.

²⁹⁸ Gray (1986), 116.

devoted to the study of Xenophon's literary achievements and connection to other Greek thinkers (including Socrates, of course), she does not mention the *Hiero* in the section on Xenophon's use of Socratic irony.²⁹⁹ Obviously, one main problem of this theory is that though the dialogue on the whole is at least 'quasi-Socratic', it is impossible to recognise either Simonides or Hiero in it as 'an admirable or paradigm figure in the manner of Socrates, Cyrus or Lycurgus'.³⁰⁰

For the same problem, Leo Strauss, the author of an important monograph on the *Hiero*, offers a different explanation by assigning combined multiple roles on the character of Simonides. He thinks that Simonides first presents himself as a wise man always desirous to learn;³⁰¹ while Hiero is so foolish that he takes Simonides' ignorance seriously.³⁰² However, Hiero is still wise and eloquent enough to defeat Simonides in the first part of debate and Simonides allows him to do so.³⁰³ But afterwards Simonides changes into other wiser roles and 'speaks no longer as a somewhat diffident pupil but with the confidence of a teacher',³⁰⁴ and Hiero has nothing to answer him at all. Based on that interpretation, Leo Strauss claims that sometimes the function of Simonides is the same as the stranger from Elea in Plato's works³⁰⁵ and interprets the conversation between Hiero and Simonides as one between citizen and stranger.³⁰⁶ While he also argues that the historical Aristippus, a sophist playing a negative role in the *Memorabilia* (Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.1-34), is also part of the model of Xenophon's Simonides.³⁰⁷ As such changes of roles are very rare in Xenophon's other works containing dialogues, Leo Strauss finally concludes that the *Hiero* is a very atypical dialogue of Xenophon beyond his usual style.³⁰⁸

A third view on the nature of the *Hiero* is represented by Roberta Sevieri, who

²⁹⁹ Gray (2011), 331ff.

³⁰⁰ Hobden and Tuplin (2012), 28.

³⁰¹ Strauss (1963), 36.

³⁰² Strauss (1963), 43-44.

³⁰³ Strauss (1963), 89.

³⁰⁴ Strauss (1963), 82.

³⁰⁵ Strauss (1963), 79.

³⁰⁶ Strauss (1963), 85.

³⁰⁷ Strauss (1963), 104.

³⁰⁸ Strauss (1963), 96.

suggests that ‘the first surprising aspect of this dialogue is the very fact whether it is a dialogue at all — that is to say, that both parties are present at, and engaged in, the exchange of ideas’.³⁰⁹ In her view, the *Hiero* is an epinician poem disguised as a philosophical dialogue, as only one leading and consistent opinion is presented throughout the dialogue. In my opinion, it is a little arbitrary to claim that Xenophon’s *Hiero* is an epinician poem, and it is even more dubious that the form of dialogue would achieve the expected effect of the so-called lyric ‘I’ Roberta Sevieri mentions. In spite of that, Roberta Sevieri rightly points out that only one leading opinion is actually presented in the whole dialogue.³¹⁰

A thorough analysis on the nature of the *Hiero* and the category of literary genre to which it belongs is of course beyond the boundary of my study; and I believe that the discussion of these topics must remain open as long as we possess no more relevant external evidence. However, it is noteworthy that Roberta Sevieri’s one key point, that is to say that the *Hiero* actually only presents one opinion on the disadvantages of tyranny and advantages of true kingship, is also what V.J. Gray and Leo Strauss realise. This basic fact recognised by most modern scholars is of crucial importance for me to interpret Xenophon’s attitude towards potential organisers and executors of his ambitious social education, namely the current Greek tyrants and the future ideal monarchs.

According to V.J. Gray’s early assumption of the application of ‘Socratic irony’, what Simonides does is to ‘enlighten’ Hiero and help him realise the disadvantages of tyranny and advantages of true kingship for the governor himself. While in Leo Strauss’ theory, the combination of the roles of listener and varied philosophers in Simonides enables Xenophon to express his own thought through Hiero and Simonides’ mouth respectively. Therefore, all the three main researchers on Xenophon’s *Hiero* agree that only one main opinion representing Xenophon himself

³⁰⁹ Sevieri (2004), 279.

³¹⁰ Sevieri (2004), 279.

is emphasised and presented fully in the dialogue. Therefore, although we do not know everything about the nature of Xenophon's *Hiero* precisely yet, we can still summarise a concise version of Xenophon's advice to a 'tyrant (though he might be fictional and much more reasonable than those cruel Greek tyrants in reality)', the potential prime mover of the ideal social education of morality Xenophon always dreams of. In my opinion, on the one hand, the advice is highly rhetorical and in some cases unconvincing; on the other hand, it represents Xenophon's sincere intention to persuade his readers to put his moral education into practice and his steadfast belief in the possibility of achieving ultimate happiness and progress of social morality.

b. The Rhetorical Features of Xenophon's *Hiero*

In comparison to Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, his most important work on the government of an ideal monarch, the divergence of the version we find in the *Hiero* is quite striking and therefore noteworthy. Certain features do reappear here, while others are either entirely omitted or largely adapted. And even the repeated elements tend to be expressed in a much plainer way. In my opinion, such adaption is rhetorical, and shows transition of the expected readership (from readers eager to learn the art of kingship to tyrants and other sceptical readers who need to be persuaded) and writing style (from a plain style to a highly rhetorical one) of Xenophon rather than his own thought; and the substitution of contents in the *Cyropaedia* or the *Agesilaus* in the *Hiero* is due to the rhetorical nature of this dialogue, which in most cases does not reflect Xenophon's own idea in a philosophical sense. By these rhetorical means, Xenophon succeeded in producing a persuasive dialogue to argue that virtuous leadership is beneficial for political leaders to pursue their own happiness as well, which serves as one important element in his whole system of moral education.

α. Exchange of Roles between Hiero and Simonides

The very first sentence of the dialogue tells us the identity of the two persons involved: ‘Simonides, the poet, once paid a visit to Hiero, the despot’ (Xen. *Hier.* 1.1). In Greek cultural background, it is clear that the court poet must be a wise adviser, and the tyrant should ask him for suggestions. Nevertheless, the development of the conversation is out of the reader’s expectation. Because Simonides suddenly suggests to Hiero:

I know you were born a private person (ιδιώτης) and you are now a despot (τύραννος). Therefore, as you have experienced both fortunes, you probably know better than I how the lives of the despot and the private person differ as regards the joys (εὐφροσύνη) and sorrows (λύπη) that fall to man’s lot. (Xen. *Hier.* 1.2)

After certain hesitation, Hiero finally answers:

I assure you far fewer pleasures fall to despots than to private person of modest means, and many more and much greater pains. (Xen. *Hier.* 1.8)

And Simonides immediately expresses his confusion:

Incredible! Were it so, how should a despot’s throne be an object of desire to many, even those who are reputed to be men of ample means? And how should all the world envy despots? (Xen. *Hier.* 1.9)

Due to the topic of comparing despots and private persons, both Simonides and Hiero begin to play roles unfamiliar to readers. On the basis that he has experienced the life of both individuals and despot, Hiero becomes the wiser of the two, and therefore he will take the lead in the conversation and explain why the life of tyrants is worse than common people to Simonides, who is willing to learn from Hiero. At the same time, Simonides appears to be a common member of the multitude instead of a poet full of wisdom. And Hiero can even criticise Simonides that ‘That this

escapes the observation of the multitude (τὸ πλῆθος), as I say, I am not surprised. But what does seem surprising to me is that men like you, whose intelligence is supposed to give you a clearer view of most things than your eyes, should be equally blind to it' (Xen. *Hier.* 2.5). As a matter of fact, the behaviour of Simonides shows no difference from a person of ordinary intelligence throughout this part of the conversation. His so-called 'philosophy' only represents the vulgar opinion about kingship, as Leo Strauss summarises, 'tyranny is bad for the city but good for the tyrant, for the tyrannical life is the most enjoyable and desirable way of life.'³¹¹ In essence, this opinion suggests that bodily pleasure, wealth and power are more important than virtue, which would be objected to and despised by almost all great Greek philosophers, orators, historians and dramatists. As a result, the opinion of Simonides is destined to be defeated and corrected by Hiero's eloquence. And the famous poet makes no resistance: he keeps expressing surprise (Xen. *Hier.* 1.9) and allows himself to be led by Hiero's arguments; he laughs in the exact manner of 'the vulgar multitude' (Xen. *Hier.* 1.31).

However, from the beginning of section 8, Simonides and Hiero exchange their roles abruptly. Simonides suddenly suggests, 'Nevertheless, I think I can show you that rule so far from being a bar to popularity, actually has the advantage of a citizen's life.' (Xen. *Hier.* 8.1) From then on, Simonides recovers his identity and wisdom as a good advisor. He suggests that Hiero should use reward and punishment properly (Xen. *Hier.* 9.1-4); he asks him to apply mercenaries to protect public order and property of citizens instead of his own safety only (Xen. *Hier.* 10.7-8); he reminds Hiero that he should spend his money for the common good (Xen. *Hier.* 11.1); and he claims true kingship can remain undefeatable for its enemies (Xen. *Hier.* 11.13-15). We suddenly recognise Xenophon himself and his typical theory of social education, which is clearly and systematically presented in the *Cyropaedia* and Xenophon's many other writings. The shift from the vulgar listener to the eloquent

³¹¹ Strauss (1963), 40.

teacher is dramatic.

And where is Hiero at this phase of conversation? Perhaps we should say that he disappears from the stage and either recedes behind the curtain or joins with the audience to enjoy Simonides' excellent monologue. Because except for one simple comment (Xen. *Hier.* 8.8-10) and one question put forward at the beginning of section 10 (Xen. *Hier.* 10.1-4), he keeps silence throughout the speech of Simonides. As Alexander Kojève points out, Hiero keeps silence because he has no more to say.³¹² He has already finished his task; and his reaction to Simonides' advice has nothing to do with the ultimate aim of the dialogue. The dialogue does not end with the triumph of Simonides,³¹³ but it does not matter, as Xenophon's aim of composing this dialogue has already been accomplished. The main function of Hiero and Simonides is to present the disadvantages of tyrants' life and the advantages of perfect kingship to the reader of the dialogue, which is most relevant to the very subject Xenophon treats in the *Hellenica*, the *Agésilas*, the *Spartan Constitution*, and his chef-d'oeuvre on social education, the *Cyropaedia*.

According to the views of most researchers on the *Hiero*, the arguments of Hiero in the first half of the dialogue and those of Simonides in the second half should be taken as a whole, which offers a consistent and systematic narrative of Xenophon's own advice to monarchs. The first part of his advice points out the disadvantages of a tyrant's life. In the first place, a tyrant cannot see as much as others because he is only safe at home (Xen. *Hier.* 1.11-13); secondly, a tyrant can hear nothing pleasant but has to face silence of his courtiers or their praise sounding like flattery (Xen. *Hier.* 1.15); thirdly, a tyrant does not have a good appetite because he has too much delicious food to eat (Xen. *Hier.* 1.17-19). What is more, he cannot have a happy marriage because few women can equal him in social status (Xen. *Hier.* 1.27-28); he cannot make his favourites happy because they fear him (Xen. *Hier.*

³¹² Kojève (1963a), 144.

³¹³ Newell (1988), 115.

1.29-30); he has to take caution in his own city as his own brave citizens are threats to himself (Xen. *Hier.* 5.3); and finally he cannot get rid of the miserable role of tyrant as he would have no hope of escaping from revenge (Xen. *Hier.* 7.12-13). In contrast to that, a much more glorious and preferable life mode of ideal kingship is presented in Simonides' speech. Therefore, any tyrant who reads the *Hiero* would abandon tyranny and pursue true kingship and justice, if he is sufficiently convinced by Xenophon's arguments.

β. Selectiveness of Information

At the first glance, Hiero's narrative of the disadvantages of the tyrant's life is quite systematic and complete. However, further analysis reveals clearly that Xenophon omits many disadvantages of private persons in comparison to tyrants in order to justify his argument.

In arguing that tyrants cannot enjoy love from his friends as common people do, Xenophon's Hiero claims that, 'the fact is, a private person has instant proof that any act of compliance on the part of his beloved is prompted by affection, since he knows that the service rendered is due to no compulsion; but the despot can never feel sure that he is loved. For we know that acts of service prompted by fear copy as closely as possible the ministrations of affection. Indeed, even plots against despots as often as not are the work of those who profess the deepest affection for them.' (Xen. *Hier.* 1.37-38) The argument is rather one-sided, as the choice of suitable friends is a difficult problem both for tyrants and for individuals. The situation that 'the service is due to no compulsion' by no means secures sincere affection to individuals, as many other interests beyond political power would seduce evil men to show artificial love to people around them. However, in his *Memorabilia*, Xenophon shows that he is aware that private friendship is rare as well. As his Socrates implores:

ἐπιμελομένους δὲ παντὸς μᾶλλον ὁρᾷν ἔφη τοὺς πολλοὺς ἢ φίλων κτήσεως. καὶ

γὰρ οἰκίας καὶ ἀγροὺς καὶ ἀνδράποδα καὶ βοσκήματα καὶ σκεύη κτωμένους τε ἐπιμελῶς ὁρᾷν ἔφη καὶ τὰ ὄντα σφάζειν πειρωμένους, φίλον δέ, ὃ μέγιστον ἀγαθὸν εἶναί φασιν, ὁρᾷν ἔφη τοὺς πολλοὺς οὔτε ὅπως κτήσωνται φροντίζοντας οὔτε ὅπως οἱ ὄντες αὐτοῖς σφάζονται. ἀλλὰ καὶ καμνόντων φίλων τε καὶ οἰκετῶν ὁρᾷν τινὰς ἔφη τοῖς μὲν οἰκέταις καὶ ἰατροὺς εἰσάγοντας καὶ τᾶλλα τὰ πρὸς ὑγίειαν ἐπιμελῶς παρασκευάζοντας, τῶν δὲ φίλων ὀλιγοῦντας, ἀποθανόντων τε ἀμφοτέρων ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς οἰκέταις ἀχθομένους τε καὶ ζημίαν ἡγουμένους, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς φίλοις οὐδὲν οἰομένους ἐλαττοῦσθαι, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἄλλων κτημάτων οὐδὲν ἔωντας ἀθεράπευτον οὐδ' ἀνεπίσκεπτον, τῶν δὲ φίλων ἐπιμελείας δεομένων ἀμελοῦντας. ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τούτοις ὁρᾷν ἔφη τοὺς πολλοὺς τῶν μὲν ἄλλων κτημάτων, καὶ πάνυ πολλῶν αὐτοῖς ὄντων, τὸ πλῆθος εἰδόμενα, τῶν δὲ φίλων, ὀλίγων ὄντων, οὐ μόνον τὸ πλῆθος ἀγνοοῦντας, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πυνθανομένοις τοῦτο καταλέγειν ἐγχειρήσαντας, οὓς ἐν τοῖς φίλοις ἔθεσαν, πάλιν τούτους ἀνατίθεσθαι· τοσοῦτον αὐτοὺς τῶν φίλων φροντίζειν.

And yet, there is no transaction most men are as careless about as the acquisition of friends. For I find that they are careful about getting houses and lands and slaves and cattle and furniture, and anxious to keep what they have; but though they tell one that a friend is the greatest blessing, I find that most men take no thought how to get new friends or how to keep their old ones. Indeed, if one of their friends and one of their servants fall ill at the same time, I find that some call in the doctor to attend the servant and are careful to provide everything that may contribute to his recovery, whereas they take no heed of the friend. In the event of both dying, they are vexed at losing the servant, but don't feel that the death of the friend matters in the least. And though none of their other possessions is uncared for and unconsidered, they are deaf to their friends' need of attention. And besides all this, I find that most men know the number of their other possessions, however great it may be, yet cannot tell the number of their friends, few as they are; and, if they are asked and try to make a list, they will

insert names and presently remove them. So much for the thought they give to their friends! (Xen. *Mem.* 2.4.1-4)

Therefore, as a former private citizen in Athens, an exile wandering around Greece and Asia and a philosopher on morality, Xenophon himself must understand the common sense fully, yet he omits discussion of that deliberately. In my opinion, this must be considered as his effort to achieve rhetorical effect.

Similarly, Hiero also claims that ‘in the event of an expedition against an enemy’s country, private persons at least think themselves safe as soon as they have come home. But when despots reach their own city, they know that they are now among more enemies than ever.’ (Xen. *Hier.* 2.9) There are also certain omissions in contrast here. Because during the war the tyrant is protected by his best soldiers as the leader of the whole army, and common soldiers exposed in the front must suffer more dangers and they die more easily and in much greater number than tyrants and military leaders. And in peaceful times, under the reign of tyranny, private persons’ lives and properties are also in danger of being violated and oppressed by tyrants themselves, as Xenophon himself reveals clearly in the section on the Thirty in Athens of the *Hellenica* (Xen. *Hell.* 2.3.12ff). The only distinction is that a tyrant can hire foreign mercenaries to protect him; while private persons can find no way to protect themselves at all. Once again Xenophon chooses to omit such obvious facts. And Hiero becomes even more unreasonable when he says that poverty is rarer among private persons than among despots (Xen. *Hier.* 4.8-9), as the social reality shows just the opposite. Although tyrants do have to deal with a larger sum of expenditure, they are supported by a variety of financial resources. But private persons have far fewer means to manage their finance if they are in lack of income. In conclusion, the statement of Hiero is highly rhetorical. As W.R. Newell comments, ‘It is not that Hiero is lying, then, when he enumerates the drawbacks of tyranny; they certainly exist. But, in omitting the compensations of tyranny and the drawbacks

of citizenship, he gives a very one-sided diagnosis.³¹⁴

If we can say that the statement of Hiero sacrifices balanced arguments for its persuasiveness, then we can also be certain that the advice of Simonides also sacrifices philosophical profundity (which is shown in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and *Agesilaus*, as well as similar writings of his contemporary writers) for its liveliness as well as straightforwardness. A comparison between the latter part of the *Hiero* and Isocrates' *Letter to Nicocles* (which is perhaps written shortly after 374 B.C., when Nicocles became king) reveals as many differences as similarities. Both works discuss the art of kingship. But Isocrates organises his arguments strictly according to the usual categorisation of Greek ethics in his time. He gives long and rather tedious admonitions to Nicocles and asks him to practise virtue, wisdom, piety, truthfulness, meekness, self-control, moderation, urbanity and dignity,³¹⁵ in very similar manner to the organisation of material of Aristotle in his *Ethica Nicomachea*. From the *Agesilaus* we can see that Xenophon definitely knows a very similar categorisation (actually it seems to be common sense to almost all classical moral philosophers) and he does not avoid using it in suitable contexts (Xen. *Ages.* 11.1-13; *Mem.* 4.8.11). In spite of this, Xenophon abandons almost all abstract philosophical terms in the *Hiero* and adapts them into detailed, descriptive and colloquial language.

It is noteworthy that some of Xenophon's favourite abstract topics, for example obedience to established law and piety,³¹⁶ disappear completely from this dialogue. An obvious reason is that these points would not be welcomed and accepted immediately by tyrants or anyone not expert in moral philosophy;³¹⁷ and they have little to do with personal happiness of tyrants, which is exactly what Simonides and Hiero talk about. The very aim of Simonides' speech is to explain to readers the basic outline of Xenophon's idea on social morality concisely as well as selectively, and

³¹⁴ Newell (1988), 114.

³¹⁵ Strauss (1963), 96.

³¹⁶ Xen. *Cyr.* 3.3.58-59, 4.1.6, 5.1.24-25, 7.1.10, 8.1.25; Strauss (1963), 108.

³¹⁷ Compared to Aristotle's calm and objective conclusion of the way of monarchs to avoid being overthrown (Arist. *Pol.* 1313a35-1315b10), Xenophon's rhetorical treatment of the subject might be more persuasive for tyrants.

‘seduce’ them to put it into practice with the lure of Hiero’s own happiness. He argues that a tyrant would become popular if he sends his mercenary guards to maintain public order, but does not mention anything about civil law; he advises the king to reward his subjects without making analysis on the concept of justice; he encourages Hiero to improve the living standard of his people, but deliberately introduces a metaphor by which he compares it to a much more honoured game in competition with other kings than the Olympic and Pythian Games. As a matter of fact, every element attractive and helpful for tyrants to change themselves into good kings and to achieve happiness is carefully chosen and presented in the *Hiero*, while those unsuitable topics and abstract terms are totally abandoned, though they do take up central positions in Xenophon’s other works, for example the *Cyropaedia* and the *Agesilaus*.

γ. Frequent Repetition

Emphasis by repetition is another technique frequently used in *Hiero*. From 2.7 to 5.1, the subject of ‘suspicion of tyrant’ appears six times (Xen. *Hier.* 2.7-8; 2.17-18; 3.7-9; 4.2; 4.3-5; 5.1); and from 5.3 on, the topic of ‘foreign mercenaries’ is mentioned three times (Xen. *Hier.* 5.3; 6.11; 10.1-4); in the rather concise and brief speech of Simonides, the advice to reward friends is also repeated three times (Xen. *Hier.* 9.6-10; 11.1; 11.13-15). But the most impressive repetition is the summarisation of Hiero at the end of his complaint:

But now, Simonides, I want to show you all those delights that were mine when I was a private person, but which I now find are withheld from me since the day I became a despot. I communed with my fellows then: they pleased me and I please them. I communed with myself whenever I desired rest. I passed the time in carousing, often till I forgot all the troubles of mortal life, often till my soul was absorbed in songs and revels and dances, often till the desire of sleep fell on

me and all the company. But now I am cut off from those who had pleasure in me, since slaves instead of friends are my comrades; I am cut off from my pleasant intercourse with them, since I see in them no sign of good-will towards me. Drink and sleep I avoid as a snare. To fear a crowd, and yet fear solitude, to fear to go unguarded, and yet fear the very men who guard you, to recoil from attendants unarmed and yet dislike seeing them armed — surely that is a cruel predicament! (Xen. *Hier.* 6.1-4)

This charming monologue shows typical features of rhetoric, not daily colloquial dialogue. Nobody in real life would talk to others in that way, because almost all the contents of it has already been treated above and are only repeated here for emphasis. This is standard repetition used at the end of orations to draw the attention of the audience and conclude the whole speech, as Xenophon himself did in his funeral encomium for Agesilaus (Xen. *Ages.* 11.1-13) and Cicero in a later age summarised in theory (Cic. *Part. or.* 52-54). The feature reveals again the similarity of Xenophon's *Hiero* to court orations and other rhetorical works.

In sum, the rhetorical features of Xenophon's *Hiero* are quite obvious. Exchange of role, a skill seldom used in Xenophon's other works, is adopted to make the whole dialogue into persuasive advice for tyrants. His statements and arguments presented in this abnormal version of advice to political leaders are highly selective and full of rhetorical repetitions. As a result, the logical system and certain opinions against common sense shown here should not be taken seriously, as the way we treated to the *Cyropaedia* in the chapter above. In my opinion, as a moral philosopher, Xenophon does not really care at all about whether his perfect political leader would enjoy better sight-seeing, pleasing sounds, sweet food and drinks, or sexual pleasures than private persons or not (though his Simonides pretends to care about those trivial things 'hypocritically'); and the omission of Xenophon's typical elements, such as justice and piety, is only due to rhetorical considerations.³¹⁸ By sacrificing the

³¹⁸ In my opinion, V.J. Gray's complex explanation of the absence of the discussion on justice in the dialogue,

integrity of his thought system on the ideal leadership for social education, Xenophon manages to achieve the very effect of persuasiveness with the *Hiero*'s elegant writing style, which shows his great effort to solve the first of the two difficulties for the practice of social education (reluctance of tyrants to undertake toil and difficulty to maintain unstable political power) we mentioned in the opening part of this chapter.

c. The Ultimate Aim of Rhetorical Means

The frequent and skilled application of rhetorical methods does not mean that Xenophon's *Hiero* is deceitful or inferior in value. On the contrary, it is good evidence of both Xenophon's outstanding talent and firm will to broadcast his idea of social education to every potential leader among his readers. In the first place, the mature rhetorical skills displayed here shows that Xenophon is as expert as Gorgias, Isocrates and Lysias at the application of rhetoric to support his arguments. In the second place, Xenophon's *Hiero* is superior to typical epideictic orations, such as the two pieces of the *Helen* by Gorgias and Isocrates which are almost purely for oratory practice and entertainment, in the sense that it serves a very serious practical purpose from the very beginning to the end — to persuade the readers to adopt a just, moral way of life and to pursue true happiness in a philosophical sense as Xenophon himself hopes.

In the chapter above on the *Cyropaedia*, we have already examined the basic structure and crucial principles of the ideal constitution set up by Xenophon's Cyrus the Great. Under his government, people are regulated by laws, piety, rational administration and all kinds of virtues; the final aim of his social education is to accomplish the progress of morality throughout the whole society; and the crucial

which assumes that Simonides' vision is in accord with Arist. *Pol.* 1284a3ff (Gray (2011), 175), is not quite necessary. These abstract and perhaps tedious topics are simply avoided here for the benefit of rhetorical effects.

organiser of everything is Cyrus the Great, the ideal political leader on behalf of true kingship instead of tyranny. However, in order to put this mode of government into practice, the ideal leader not only must possess wisdom, knowledge, charisma as well as all kinds of virtues, he also has to be prepared to suffer from hardship and make great sacrifice all his life, as the advice Cyrus got from his father indicates:

Ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μέν, ἔφη, ὦ παῖ, χαλεπὸν τὸ ἀεὶ δύνασθαι εὖ ποιεῖν οὓς ἂν τις ἐθέλῃ· τὸ δὲ συνηδόμενόν τε φαίνεσθαι, ἣν τι ἀγαθὸν αὐτοῖς συμβαίνει, καὶ συναχθόμενον, ἣν τι κακόν, καὶ συνεπικουρεῖν προθυμούμενον ταῖς ἀπορίαις αὐτῶν, καὶ φοβούμενον μὴ τι σφαλῶσι, καὶ προνοεῖν πειρώμενον ὥς μὴ σφάλλωνται, ταῦτά πως δεῖ μᾶλλον συμπαρομαρτεῖν. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πράξεων δέ, ἣν μὲν ἐν θέρει ὦσι, τὸν ἄρχοντα δεῖ τοῦ ἡλίου πλεονεκτοῦντα φανερόν εἶναι· ἣν δὲ ἐν χειμῶνι, τοῦ ψύχους· ἣν δὲ διὰ μόχθων, τῶν πόνων· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα εἰς τὸ φιλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων συλλαμβάνει.

Yes, my son, it is always a difficult matter to be in a position to do good to people as you wish; but show that you rejoice with them if any good befall them, that you sympathise with them if any ill betide, that you are anxious that they be not crossed in any way, and that you try to prevent their being crossed; it is in those respects that you ought rather to go hand in hand with them. And in his campaigns also, if they fall in the summer time, the general must show that he can endure the heat of the sun better than his soldiers can, and that he can endure cold better than they if it be in winter; if the way lead through difficulties, that he can endure hardships better. All this contributes to his being loved by his men.

(Xen. *Cyr.* 1.6.24-25)

A very similar narrative on the pursuit of moral virtue (though not only for political leaders this time) is also given by Prodicus in the parable of Heracles in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*:

τῶν γὰρ ὄντων ἀγαθῶν καὶ καλῶν οὐδὲν ἄνευ πόνου καὶ ἐπιμελείας θεοὶ διδόασιν ἀνθρώποις, ἀλλ' εἴτε τοὺς θεοὺς ἴλεως εἶναί σοι βούλει, θεραπευτέον

τοὺς θεοὺς, εἴτε ὑπὸ φίλων ἐθέλεις ἀγαπᾶσθαι, τοὺς φίλους εὐεργετητέον, εἴτε ὑπὸ τινος πόλεως ἐπιθυμεῖς τιμᾶσθαι, τὴν πόλιν ὠφελήτέον, εἴτε ὑπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος πάσης ἀξιοῖς ἐπ' ἀρετῇ θαυμάζεσθαι, τὴν Ἑλλάδα πειρατέον εὖ ποιεῖν, εἴτε γῆν βούλει σοι καρποὺς ἀφθόνους φέρειν, τὴν γῆν θεραπευτέον, εἴτε ἀπὸ βοσκημάτων οἶει δεῖν πλουτίζεσθαι, τῶν βοσκημάτων ἐπιμελητέον, εἴτε διὰ πολέμου ὁρμᾷς αὖξεσθαι καὶ βούλει δύνασθαι τοὺς τε φίλους ἐλευθεροῦν καὶ τοὺς ἐχθροὺς χειροῦσθαι, τὰς πολεμικὰς τέχνας αὐτάς τε παρὰ τῶν ἐπισταμένων μαθητέον καὶ ὅπως αὐταῖς δεῖ χρῆσθαι ἀσκητέον· εἰ δὲ καὶ τῷ σώματι βούλει δυνατὸς εἶναι, τῇ γνώμῃ ὑπηρετεῖν ἐθιστέον τὸ σῶμα καὶ γυμναστέον σὺν πόνοις καὶ ἰδρῶτι.

For of all things good and fair, the gods give nothing to man without toil and effort. If you want the favour of the gods, you must worship the gods: if you desire the love of friends, you must do good to your friends: if you covet honour from a city, you must aid that city: if you are fain to win the admiration of all Hellas for virtue, you must strive to do good to Hellas: if you want land to yield you fruits in abundance, you must cultivate that land: if you are resolved to get wealth from flocks, you must care for those flocks: if you essay to grow great through war and want power to liberate your friends and subdue your foes, you must learn the arts of war from those who know them and must practise their right use: and if you want your body to be strong, you must accustom your body to be the servant of your mind, and train it with toil and sweat. (Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.28.)

In these two important paragraphs cited above, Xenophon explains the true nature of moral life suitable for ideal political leaders and perfect heroes seriously. They not only need to undertake toil with their followers and friends together, but also have to suffer extreme pains. They must endure more hardship than common people, as Cyrus' father instructs; and they must take endless responsibilities to follow a virtuous life like Heracles in legend. Actually, in order to accomplish these

tasks, political leaders are required to disregard and even give up their personal happiness. Obviously, advice of such a kind can be justified in theory, but it cannot be pleasant to tyrants' ears. According to the logic of common people represented by Simonides in the first part of the *Hiero*, they would rather choose tyranny, which is 'bad for the city but good for the tyrant'.³¹⁹ Therefore, the task of the *Hiero* is to persuade tyrants (and all readers who have not adopted a virtuous life yet) to believe that the government of ideal kingship can also be of benefit to themselves. In the first part of the dialogue, Xenophon explains by the mouth of Hiero the disadvantages of a tyrant in comparison to private persons. His narrative is not unassailable, but is impressive and eloquent, as well as successful, according to the final goal it aims for. While in the second part of the work, Xenophon sets forth his arguments that the life of ideal kingship is suitable and preferable for political leaders, because it is the only way towards true happiness in a philosophical sense.

As a moralist who follows the tradition of Socrates in the study of ethical subjects, Xenophon holds the belief firmly that true and everlasting happiness lies in something other than sensual pleasure,³²⁰ as the opening part of the long speech of his Simonides shows:

For indeed it seems to me, Hiero, that in this man differs from other animals — I mean, in this craving for honour. In meat and drink and sleep and sexual desire all creatures alike seem to take pleasure; but love of honour is rooted neither in the brute beasts nor in every human being. But for those in whom a passion for honour and praise is implanted, these are elements by which they differ most from the beasts of the field; they are accounted men (ἄνδρες) and not mere human beings (ἄνθρωποι). (Xen. *Hier.* 7.3)

Based on this premise, that pleasure from honour and praise is the superior and true happiness for virtuous men, Xenophon goes on to argue that it is really possible

³¹⁹ Strauss (1963), 40.

³²⁰ Schorn (2011), 69-70.

for a tyrant to get rid of the 'miserable' situation Hiero describes with rhetorical skills by adopting true kingship. A tyrant is potentially happier than a private person, because he has much greater chance to accomplish glorious feats and win sincere respect for himself. As Simonides states:

ἀλλ' ἔμοιγε δοκεῖ καὶ ἐκ θεῶν τιμὴ τις καὶ χάρις συμπαρέπεσθαι ἀνδρὶ ἄρχοντι.
μὴ γὰρ ὅτι καλλίονα ποιεῖ ἄνδρα, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τοῦτον ἥδιον θεώμεθα τε
ὅταν ἄρχῃ ἢ ὅταν ιδιωτεύῃ, διαλεγόμενοι τε ἀγαλλόμεθα τοῖς προτετιμημένοις
μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ ἴσου ἡμῖν οὔσι. καὶ μὴν παιδικὰ γε, ἐν οἷς δὴ καὶ σὺ
μάλιστα κατεμέμψω τὴν τυραννίδα, ἥκιστα μὲν γῆρας ἄρχοντος δυσχεραίνει,
ἥκιστα δ' αἴσχος, πρὸς ὃν ἂν τυγχάνῃ ὁμιλῶν, τούτου ὑπολογίζεται. αὐτὸ γὰρ τὸ
τετιμῆσθαι μάλιστα συνεπικοσμεῖ, ὥστε τὰ μὲν δυσχερῆ ἀφανίζειν, τὰ δὲ καλὰ
λαμπρότερα ἀναφαίνειν. ὁπότε γε μὴν ἐκ τῶν ἴσων ὑπουργημάτων μειζόνων
χαρίτων ὑμεῖς τυγχάνετε, πῶς οὐκ ἐπειδὴν γε ὑμεῖς πολλαπλάσια μὲν
διαπράττοντες ὠφελεῖν δύνησθε, πολλαπλάσια δὲ δωρεῖσθαι ἔχητε, ὑμᾶς καὶ
πολὺ μᾶλλον φιλεῖσθαι τῶν ιδιωτῶν προσήκει;

In my opinion, even the gods cause a peculiar honour and favour to dance attendance on a great ruler. For not only does rule add dignity of presence to a man, but we find more pleasure in the sight of that man when he is a ruler than in that of our equals. And favorites mark you, who were the subject of your bitterest complaint against despotism, are not offended by old age in a ruler, and take no account of ugliness in the patron with whom they happen to be associated. For high rank in itself is a most striking embellishment to the person: it casts a shade over anything repulsive in him and shows up his best features in a high light. Moreover, inasmuch as equal services rendered by you rulers are rewarded with deeper gratitude, surely, when you have the power of doing far more for others by your activities, and can lavish far more gifts on them, isn't it natural that you should be much more deeply loved than private persons? (Xen. *Hier.* 8.5-7)

In my view, this passage explains one important reason why the ideal political leader would be so crucial for Xenophon's social education. He not only possesses indispensable power to put necessary reformation and rational administration into practice, but also has great fame and influence to shape the morality of the whole society, both for the benefit of his people and for his personal happiness. He should compete with other monarchs for good reputation and popularity (Xen. *Hier.* 11.7-11); he will be loved and adored by mankind (Xen. *Hier.* 11.12-13); he can enrich himself while enriching his friend (Xen. *Hier.* 11.13-15); and he possesses the fairest and most blessed possession in the world, the happiness (εὐδαιμονία) none will be jealous of (Xen. *Hier.* 11.15). The sense of persuasion here is quite explicit: in the theoretical system of the *Cyropaedia*, the first and foremost purpose of social education and government is the well-being of the citizens; but here Xenophon only emphasises the happiness of the king.³²¹ All information he presents is selective, rhetorical and persuasive. In that case, it is easy to see that the *Hiero* should not be taken as a 'minor' or 'light' work. Its style is easy and fluent, but it was composed with great care and ambitious intention, as well as supported by advanced rhetorical skills and innovative talent of Xenophon.³²²

In spite of that, we should also notice that though the *Hiero* is on the whole highly rhetorical, it still presents some serious and important ideas in Xenophon's thought system. In Xenophon's eyes, the pursuit of self-interest is not incompatible with benevolence and it is actually based on the latter. This view is also justified in the *Cyropaedia*, the *Memorabilia* and the *Oeconomicus* and serves as a theoretical basis of Xenophon's ethical doctrine.³²³

Then is the *Hiero* a dialogue specially written for a certain tyrant to read? We know nothing about the background of its composition, but in my opinion it is not

³²¹ Aalders (1953), 213-214.

³²² Actually, in the *Resp.* 412c-421d, Plato also tries to demonstrate how the leaders of his ideal state can become the happiest men in the world while suffering so much toil. Nevertheless, instead of following Plato's purer philosophical way of thinking, Xenophon managed to develop his own art of persuasion, which makes his argument equally original and worth noticing.

³²³ Danzig (2012), 499.

necessary to be the case. First of all, the restriction of the readership to political leaders is not quite reasonable. As Leo Strauss points out, ‘only a very small part of its readers can be supposed to be actual tyrants. The work as a whole may therefore have to be taken as a recommendation addressed to properly equipped young men who are pondering what way of life they should choose — a recommendation to strive for tyrannical power, not indeed to gratify their desires, but to gain the love and admiration of all men by deeds of benevolence on the greatest possible scale.’³²⁴ Therefore the *Hiero* can serve as an ethical instruction to both actual political leaders and private citizens. In the second place, for Xenophon’s thought system, the distinction between the political sphere and other aspects of social life is not absolute. As his Ischomachus claims in the *Oeconomicus*, even a farmer can make use of the laws of Draco and Solon to manage his household affairs (Xen. *Oec.* 14.4). Therefore, it can be helpful for ordinary people to read the advice for tyrants, in order to organise their own private life better. I will discuss the correspondence between the public and private spheres in detail in Part 3, Chapter 2 on the *Oeconomicus*.

In sum, the *Hiero* is one of the most innovative works in the corpus of Xenophon. It is advice to political leaders as well as common readers in the form of dialogue and expressed by mouths of different characters; it is highly selective and makes use of many rhetorical skills; its ultimate aim is to persuade readers by the lure of material pleasure so that they may adopt a virtuous life in accordance with their identities in order to achieve highest happiness in a philosophical sense.

III. Original Inspirations of the *Hiero* and the Character of Xenophon’s Composing Creativity

As E.C. Marchant points out, ‘there is no attempt at characterisation in the persons of the dialogue’, and Hiero presented in the dialogue ‘is not in the least the historical

³²⁴ Strauss (1963), 29.

Hiero whom we know from the Odes of Pindar and Bacchylides. He is not the great warrior or the enlightened ruler; and of course there is no indication of the true basis of his power and of his constitutional position. He is just a despot of the better type'.³²⁵ Although Athenaeus does cite Xenophon's *Hiero* to show historical details of tyrants' dining manners (Athen. 4.144c-e), his uncritical attitude makes his statement highly dubious and it is not much valued by modern scholars.³²⁶ As a matter of fact, it is striking that Xenophon, a historian and the author of historical works such as the *Hellenica* and the *Anabasis*, would be ignorant of Hiero's great feats and activities in the history of Syracuse, as the topic is picked up by both Herodotus before him and Diodorus after him in their very general historical works. According to their narrative, Hiero got his power from his younger brother Gelon (Hdt. 7.156; Diod. Sic. 11.38.2-3), and reigned over Syracuse for eleven years and eight months (Diod. Sic. 11.38.7). He oppressed cruelly another brother, Polyzelus, in suspicion of his ambition and threat, and finally forced the latter to take refuge with Theron, the tyrant of Acragas (Diod. Sic. 11.48.3-5). He removed the people of Naxos and Catana from their hometowns to build Aetna (Diod. Sic. 11.49.1-2). He supported the sons of Anaxilas, the former tyrant of Zancle (Diod. Sic. 11.66.1). He finally died in Catana and received the honour suitable for a hero (Diod. Sic. 11.66.4), but was criticised by historians as a tyrant 'avaricious and violent', being 'an utter stranger to sincerity and nobility of character' (Diod. Sic. 11.67.3-4). However, we can see clearly in Xenophon's *Hiero* that the image of the tyrant depicted has nothing to do at all with his historical character. On the one hand, though many of Hiero's deeds are relevant to the discussion of tyranny and the art of government, it is obvious that Xenophon has no interest to talk about them or even bother himself to collect these materials at all; on the other hand, the character of Hiero described in the dialogue is very different and contradictory to the vain, violent and insidious

³²⁵ Marchant (1925), xv-xvi.

³²⁶ Fearn (2002), 61-62.

tyrant who reigned Syracuse in nearly twelve years by force.

Therefore, it seems quite unlikely that Xenophon's basic materials in the *Hiero* are drawn from historical material of the tyrant Hiero's deeds or adapted on the basis of some historical background directly. And there is also certain external evidence which indicates that Xenophon generally does not take historical accuracy into consideration when he composes dialogues. For example, in the *Memorabilia*, Xenophon's Socrates would even claim that Thebes is the most imminent enemy of Athens when the Peloponnesian War is going on, which cannot be justified by any excuses except that the author pays very little attention to chronological accuracy for his fictional dialogues.³²⁷ And the main inspiration of the *Oeconomicus* also comes from Xenophon's theory of social education instead of life experience, as will be shown in Part 3 of this thesis. In my opinion, the origin of the *Hiero*'s inspiration is multiple, including traditions of Greek lyric, historiography, moral philosophy and oratory. The successful combination and adaptation of all these elements prove Xenophon's talent as a master of literary composition and theory and a creative moral philosopher.

'In the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, he (Xenophon) is compared as a philosopher to Plato, and found wanting; he is compared as a historian to Thucydides, and found wanting.'³²⁸ This is the summarisation of Leo Strauss of Xenophon's neglected status in modern scholarship. In my opinion, on the one hand, we have to admit that the thought of Xenophon is less profound and original than Plato or Aristotle, and his historical works are inferior to Herodotus and Thucydides in quality; on the other hand, however, we do have sufficient reasons to praise Xenophon's great contribution to classical Greek culture in his own manner. In recent scholarship, V.J. Gray's innovative monograph, *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes*, already begins to evaluate Xenophon 'as a literary artist worth analyzing, as an

³²⁷ Delatte (1933), 62-63.

³²⁸ Strauss (1963), 25.

innovator in his adaptations of previous literature, in his engagement with the reader in his overt evaluations, in his creation of his own formulaic scenes, in the theory of viewing and the theory of irony and of allegory, in his development of narrative devices such as the epilogue and in his use of irony',³²⁹ overall, as a first-class master on different literary forms and even certain literary theories.

One of the predominant merits of Xenophon is his talent to combine features of contemporary or older works and adapt them for his own purpose, and his audacious and innovative experiments in new genres of Greek literature. For the traditions of memoir, biography, historical novel, agricultural writing and technical guide, Xenophon deserves to be honoured as one of the most important founding fathers. He also improves the annalistic method of Thucydides for history.³³⁰ And the *Hiero* is a further innovative achievement in the genre of dialogue composed by combination of elements drawn from lyric, history, philosophy and oratory.

Of the question whether connections can be drawn between the *Hiero* and certain pieces of Greek lyric poetry, most scholars' opinions are negative. They believe that the plot of the dialogue is totally fictional and therefore does not have much relevance with Greek lyric tradition. E.C. Marchant denies that Xenophon's *Hiero* has anything to do with Pindar and Bacchylides' odes, and he believes that the image of the poet Simonides in the dialogue mainly stands for Xenophon himself.³³¹ Theodor Marschall claims that 'daß die Form des Gesprächs zwischen Hieron und Simonides nur eine Einkleidung eigener Ideen Xenophons darstellt, ist klar.'³³² In a biography of Bacchylides, A. Severyns complains that the relationship between Sicilian tyrants and lyric poets 'est un des plus difficiles de l'histoire littéraire',³³³ yet he does not try to draw anything from the *Hiero* as reliable or suggestive evidence

³²⁹ Gray (2011), 372.

³³⁰ The abrupt interruption of narrative for the convenience of putting all materials into strict chronological order is often criticised by later readers (c.f. Dion. Hal. *Thuc.* 9). In his *Hellenica*, Xenophon chooses to follow chronological order roughly, but pays attention to preserve the integrity of each plot in his work. This innovative and flexible method of narrative makes his history more readable.

³³¹ Marchant (1925), xvi.

³³² Marschall (1928), 96.

³³³ Severyns (1933), 74-75.

to explain the relationship between Hiero and Simonides. Orlando Poltera embodies the very first sentence of the *Hiero* into the testimony of his collection of Simonides' fragments, yet refrains himself from discussing the possibility of its connection with any extant fragments by the brief comment that 'es folgt ein fingierter Dialog zwischen Simonides und Hieron'.³³⁴

Nevertheless, a second view does exist. Roberta Sevieri sets forth an assumption that the *Hiero* might be an adaptation of an epinician poem, or the product of faithful imitation of the style of Simonides' epinician poetry.³³⁵ And she even presumes that Xenophon utilises the form of dialogue to reproduce the effect of lyric 'I' in original poetic work.³³⁶ In my view, Sevieri's evidence is still insufficient, and her hypothesis contains two main problems. First, one crucial premise for her conclusion is that 'after all, the recipients of that kind of poetry did belong to the same social class to which Xenophon and his readers belonged'.³³⁷ But this argument is rather weak and subjective, and even Sevieri herself cannot exclude the possibility that 'choosing a poet for the role of Hiero's partner in this dialogue, and more specifically an epinician poet, could have been mere chance'.³³⁸ It is not quite certain that Simonides would appear to be a 'pure' epinician poet in Xenophon's eyes. According to the *Suda*, Simonides attempts the composition of many genres of lyric poetry (*Suda*, Vol. IV, 361 (in Adler)); and it is only through Alexandrian tradition of poetry compilation that his name is firmly connected to epinician poetry first and foremost.³³⁹ What is more, throughout the corpus of Xenophon, no evidence shows that Xenophon ever writes poems, or it is his habit to cite or study lyric poetry in his works. His *Agesilaus* shows typical features of encomium, but it is generally believed to be borrowed indirectly through Isocrates.³⁴⁰ Only Xenophon's Socrates

³³⁴ Poltera (2008), 86.

³³⁵ Sevieri (2004), 279.

³³⁶ Sevieri (2004), 279.

³³⁷ Sevieri (2004), 285.

³³⁸ Sevieri (2004), 277.

³³⁹ Poltera (2008), 9.

³⁴⁰ Leo (1901), 92.

sometimes cites Homer in the *Memorabilia* and the *Symposium*, and he also cites Theognis twice (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.20; *Symp.* 2.4.) and Hesiod (Xen. *Mem.* 1.2.56) once.³⁴¹ But that is all. Though as we have discussed in Part 1, Chapter 2 of this thesis, Socrates' method of taking poems as evidence for moral philosophy does have some influence on Xenophon; but the impact is trivial and Xenophon's reaction is rather passive. Therefore, there is no clear evidence to indicate that Xenophon is familiar with Simonides' work, especially the epinician lyrics well known by us, as it is very likely that Simonides was equally or even more famous for his composition in other literary genres in Xenophon's time. In the second place, if the *Hiero* is drawn directly from Simonides or other poets' epinician lyrics, it would be hard to explain why it would condemn Hiero's participation in athletic games as luxury and vanity (Xen. *Hier.* 11.5-6). Simonides himself is believed to be the first poet 'to write a song for pay' (Simon. T22 (in Campbell)); his disciple Pindar and his nephew Bacchylides are both famous for composing odes for Hiero and other victors in games. In sum, I believe that Sevieri's hypothesis remains immature and more supportive evidence is still needed.

In spite of this, it is quite probable that Xenophon does borrow certain details from Greek lyrical tradition, either directly or indirectly, besides Simonides' name. In one of Bacchylides' odes for Hiero, Apollo warns a king that 'since you are mortal, you must foster two thoughts: that tomorrow will be the only day on which you see the sun's light, and that for fifty years you will live out a life steeped in wealth. Gladden your heart by doing righteous deeds: this is the highest of gains.' (Bacchyl. 3.75-84 (in Snell)) And in Pindar's *Pythian Ode* 3, Hiero is praised for being a virtuous king who is kind to his people and does not envy good men (Pind. *Pyth.* 3.70-71). These descriptions share certain similarity to the content of Xenophon's *Hiero*, and Xenophon's subject and his description of certain details might be partially inspired by these poems. What is more, in my opinion, the general scene of

³⁴¹ Gray (2011), 130.

the *Hiero* must be highly relevant to archaic poetic tradition of ancient Greece. When Xenophon composes his *Hiero*, he must bear in mind a typical scene of interaction between a king and a poet. Traditionally, a poet should praise the glorious deeds of kings and give wise advice or moral admonition to them when it is necessary, just in the way historical Simonides, Pindar and Bacchylides did for Syracusan tyrants and Hesiod (Hes. *Theog.* 22-34) and Herodotus (Hdt. 1.32) depicted in their works. And Simonides' teaching on moral issues is also in accordance with the function of poets and poetry in Xenophon's Socratic writings, such as his *Symposium* and *Memorabilia*, which has been discussed in the first part of this dissertation.

Second, in classical historiography, the meeting between a king and a wise man and the following discussion of unstable fortune of kings is already a typical plot in Herodotus' work. In Hdt. 1.32, Herodotus tells the classic story of Solon and Croesus. In Solon's opinion, the happiness of a king is always at risk because man's fortune keeps changing; as every day in his life brings something new, even the destiny of a powerful, rich and temporarily lucky king remains uncertain and unpredictable. What is more, the gods are jealous and 'there are many to whom heaven has given a vision of blessedness, and yet afterwards brought them to utter ruin' (Hdt. 1.32). A similar scene and logic reappears in Hdt. 7.46, when Xerxes' uncle Artabanus admonishes the proud Persian king that 'the god is seen to be envious therein, after he has given us but a taste of the sweetness of living'. We have no direct evidence from Xenophon's own works to prove that he used to study or at least know Herodotus' history.³⁴² Nevertheless, as Dionysius of Halicarnassus believes that Xenophon actually modeled his literary style upon Herodotus (Dion. Hal. *Pomp.* 4; *De Imit.* 2.1-6), and as the conversation between Solon and Croesus is so famous that it has great influence on later literature composition,³⁴³ it is very likely that Xenophon does borrow the subject from Herodotus either directly or indirectly.

³⁴² Hirsch (1985), 68.

³⁴³ Gray (1986), 120.

In the third place, discussion on the pursuit of happiness is a very popular motive in the fourth century B.C. ethical philosophy. In one of the most systematic Greek works on ethics composed in this period, the *Ethica Nicomachea*, Aristotle summarises that the ultimate goal of ethical studies is the ‘Supreme Good (τὸ ἄριστον)’ (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1094a22), while ‘the great majority of mankind’ would equal that concept to ‘happiness (εὐδαιμονίαν)’, which means ‘the good life (τὸ δ’ εὖ ζῆν)’ or ‘‘doing well (εὐδαιμονεῖν)’ (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1095a19-20). He further states that ‘to be happy takes a complete lifetime. For one swallow does not make summer, nor does one fine day; and similarly one day or a brief period of happiness does not make a man supremely blessed and happy’ (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1098a16-18). Therefore, pursuit of happiness comprises the predominant content of the ethical system presented in the *Ethica Nicomachea*. And clearly it is not only the idea of Aristotle himself. In the *Letter to Nicocles*, Isocrates compares the life of the tyrant and the private person, and sets forth the question which of the two is happier (Isoc. *Letter to Nicocles*, 2-6). And he answers himself in another letter to the children of Jason: ‘to me the life of a private person seems preferable and better than that of a king, and I regard the honours received under constitutional governments as more gratifying than those under monarchies.’ (Isoc. *Letter to the Children of Jason*, 11) Still we have no definite evidence to indicate whether Xenophon knows about the ideas of Isocrates and Aristotle; but as a leading philosopher on ethics and moral education himself, it is very likely that the existence and popularity of the philosophical discussions on happiness, especially the comparison between tyrants and private persons are well known to him and give him some valuable inspirations when he wrote the *Hiero*.

Finally, clear signs of imitation of political and court speeches in that age can be recognised in the *Hiero*. Modern readers generally take Xenophon as a historian and philosopher, but they often forget that he is frequently designated as ‘the orator

Xenophon' in manuscripts of his works.³⁴⁴ As set forth, the structure of *Hiero* is an oration in the form of a dialogue. And selectiveness of information and repetition are common features displayed in orations composed by Isocrates, Lysias, Demosthenes, and perhaps Thucydides and Plato.

In sum, the *Hiero* is a unique and innovative work composed by Xenophon, combining features of Greek lyric poetry, history, philosophy and oratory. It is brilliant and successful. Isocrates borrowed the matter, and even some of the language of it in his famous oration *On the Peace*.³⁴⁵ In the Hellenistic and Roman ages, it seemed to be widely read among Atticists and sophists;³⁴⁶ and it is frequently cited by Dio Chrysostom in his discourses on kingship and despotism.³⁴⁷ Niccolò Machiavelli, the founding father of modern political philosophy, is among the admirers of *Hiero* and expresses his admiration of this work in the *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio*.³⁴⁸ The tradition of 'putting forward advice to monarchs' set up by Xenophon's *Hiero* (as well as Isocrates' Cyprian orations) remains popular in modern ages and influences literary form of many classic works, including Machiavelli's *Il principe* and von Clausewitz's *Vom Kriege*. V.J. Gray also praises Xenophon, for he 'produced a highly original and highly suitable vehicle for his ideas' in the *Hiero*,³⁴⁹ and his focus on the ruler's own happiness 'makes a distinctive contribution to the theory of leadership'.³⁵⁰ These imitations and positive comments again confirm that the rhetorical and persuasive effect Xenophon pursues in the *Hiero* is achieved with great success. Such an excellent dialogue plays an important role in Xenophon's system of moral education. It tries to persuade tyrants to abandon tyranny and adopt true kingship according Xenophon's advice, not only for the benefit of their people, but also for their own happiness in a philosophical

³⁴⁴ Strauss (1963), 25.

³⁴⁵ Marchant (1925), x; Isocrates, *On the Peace*, 112-113.

³⁴⁶ Marchant (1925), xii.

³⁴⁷ Marchant (1925), xii.

³⁴⁸ Niccolò Machiavelli, *Discorsi sopra la prima deca di Tito Livio*, 2.2.19.

³⁴⁹ Gray (1986), 123.

³⁵⁰ Gray (2011), 34.

sense. On the one hand, Xenophon's persuasion is highly rhetorical and cannot always be justified in logic; on the other hand, it is innovative, impressive as well as influential and greatly enriches Xenophon's doctrine of moral education operated by ideal leadership.

Chapter 3: Dark Side of Xenophon's Social Education

I. Introduction

In 401 B.C., Cyrus the Younger started his expedition against his brother for the throne of Persia. He met bitter enemies near Babylon and was killed there (Xen. *An.* 1.8.27). His head and his right hand were cut off (Xen. *An.* 1.10.1). The Persian King and his troops plundered his abundant treasures and captured Cyrus' concubine, the Phocaeen woman who was said to be extremely clever and beautiful (Xen. *An.* 1.10.2). And almost all the main Greek generals following Cyrus the Younger in the expedition were cheated by Tissaphernes' false oath (Xen. *An.* 2.3.8) and were seized and executed.

In 399 B.C., Socrates was accused of impiety and corrupting youths, and was condemned by the Athenians to death. When Socrates was bidden to name his penalty, he refused to do so and said that the act itself implied an acknowledgment. And as his friends planned to rescue him clandestinely from prison, Socrates decided that he would not follow them, but would accept the jury's sentence and meet his death (Xen. *Ap.* 23).

In 370 B.C., Jason of Pherae went to hold a review and inspection of his cavalry, and afterwards sat in his seat to receive anyone coming to him with any request. Seven young men pretending to have some quarrels with one another came up to Jason and they suddenly struck him down and killed him. Two of them were killed by Jason's guards, but others managed to escape. Most Greeks honoured these murders because they believed Jason of Pherae would become a dangerous tyrant (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.31-32).

As a follower of Cyrus the Younger, a disciple of Socrates and a historian recording Jason's achievements, Xenophon was aware of all these events and reported them to his readers in his own writings. All the three figures are of crucial

importance for Xenophon's social and moral education, as they are all prototypes of Xenophon's ideal political leader depicted in the *Cyropaedia*, who should set up perfect examples for citizens and elevate social morality, just as the imaginary Cyrus the Great does in Xenophon's work. Nevertheless, all these three heroes failed to accomplish what Xenophon expected them to do because of their unexpected deaths; and the causes of their deaths are all political: Cyrus the Younger was killed because he ignored his personal safety in close combat for his throne; Jason of Pherae was murdered as he was notorious for his political ambition and was hated by Greek people; and even Socrates, an innocent philosophical teacher and Athenian citizen, suffered from political and ideological oppression. In the face of a complex and highly dangerous situation, how can a perfect leader succeed in controlling political power and carrying out his reform and moral education to the full? This must be another theme for which Xenophon has to consider seriously if he wishes to put his idea of social and moral education into practice.

At first glance, it seems that Xenophon never treats this subject in detail in any of his extant works. Nevertheless, in my opinion, it is possible to summarise Xenophon's answer to this question. His opinion is hidden in the depiction and hints of the dark side of ideal leaders in his works.

II. Dark Depiction of Ideal Leaders in Xenophon's Moral Education System

a. Dark Side Presented by Xenophon behind Modern Scholars' 'Dark Reading'

The problem of the so-called 'dark reading' of Xenophon has become noteworthy mainly due to some thorough studies of the *Cyropaedia* (especially of the problematic final section 8.8) in recent years. One of the most acute observations on that topic is made by Deborah Gera:

However, if we look carefully at the entire last part of the work (7.5-8.7), we shall

see that Xenophon indicates to his readers, well before the final chapter, that Cyrus is not always an ideal ruler and that the government he has created is, of necessity, less than perfect. After the conquest of Babylon, when Cyrus goes about establishing his empire and its administration, it is difficult to view the Persian ruler as consistently heroic and admirable: there is a gap between his original ideas of good conduct and the notions and actions he adopts as ruler of Babylon.³⁵¹

In Gera's view, the depiction of Cyrus the Great by Xenophon does contain something negative, and these elements become apparent immediately after Cyrus' conquest of Babylon.³⁵² For a work traditionally taken as a book on perfect government and ideal leader, this innovative observation is of course noteworthy and needs to be clarified. Up to now there are two main explanations in scholarship.

The first interpretation claims that the *Cyropaedia* is in essence an ironic work on the Persian constitution under the guise of praise of it. This opinion is represented by David M. Johnson and Christopher Whidden. David Johnson writes, 'if we strip away its rather superficial Persian décor (Tuplin 1990) and read the *Cyropaedia* as a work on empire rather than a work on Persia, there is no reason to be surprised to find Xenophon being critical of empire.'³⁵³ And Christopher Whidden develops Johnson's view and claims that 'Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* is a work of irony and that its author was very skeptical and critical of empire.'³⁵⁴ However, Johnson and Whidden's viewpoint is not supported by solid evidence. And their supposition that as an Athenian, Xenophon must be critical of empires is quite ideological and perhaps not true. On the contrary, Xenophon was generally in favour of traditional Persian and Spartan constitutions all his life (though he believed that they had both been corrupted in later years), and his political opinion is also anti-democratic. Therefore, the attempt to depict Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* as an

³⁵¹ Gera (1993), 286.

³⁵² Gera (1993), 286.

³⁵³ Johnson (2005), 203.

³⁵⁴ Whidden (2007), 540.

ironic work is to some extent oversimplified and subjective.

A second view supposes that Xenophon realised the limit of pure, philosophical morality in political life; therefore, it is easy to understand the dark side of Xenophon's Cyrus the Great, because politics cannot be totally moral even if it is in its best condition.³⁵⁵ Christopher Nadon argues that what Xenophon criticises is not Cyrus the Great or empires, but is the shortcomings of political life in general.³⁵⁶ In that case, the *Cyropaedia* as a whole 'constitutes a critique of political life in the classical world tout court'.³⁵⁷ Pierre Carlier also explains that in Xenophon's thought, benevolence and despotism are both needed to run a large empire well.³⁵⁸

In order to summarise these disputations, Vivienne Gray tags a label on these modern scholars' arguments and calls them 'dark readings' of leadership in Xenophon.³⁵⁹ In my view, the explanations of Nadon and Carlier are much more reasonable and closer to the fact, but their arguments are still incomplete because they do not take into account the corpus of Xenophon as a whole. As a matter of fact, the real basis of the modern 'dark reading' is the 'dark side'³⁶⁰ of the images of ideal leaders depicted by Xenophon himself. This dark side is by no means the exclusive property of Xenophon's Cyrus the Great alone, but a common feature shared by all major competent political leaders who appear in Xenophon's writings. In Xenophon's corpus, a dark moral standard to judge practical deeds, which is surprising for modern readers and sometimes also atypical in classical literature, co-exists with an ideal and philosophical ethics; they are generally compatible, but

³⁵⁵ Sandridge (2012), 8.

³⁵⁶ Nadon (2001), 164.

³⁵⁷ Nadon (2001), 178.

³⁵⁸ Carlier (2010), 296-297.

³⁵⁹ Gray (2011), 54-62.

³⁶⁰ The use of the very term 'dark side' inevitably contains certain vagueness in itself. Actually it is not always easy to decide whether one moral principle is 'dark' or not according to either a classical or a modern ethical standard; furthermore, it is equally difficult to tell whether one universally accepted moral standard ever existed at all. On the other hand, it is certain that we can recognise that many moral principles in Xenophon's context are dark in most modern readers' eyes; and some of them are also unique in classical cultural context. For the purpose of this thesis, I will mainly analyse the difference between Xenophon's moral standard and modern ethical value, which is adopted by me and most modern scholars on Xenophon. But I will also try to clarify the difference between Xenophon's moral principle and that of other individual classical writers' when they are comparable.

are sometimes unavoidably in tension and create some ambiguity in Xenophon's system of moral education.

b. Severe Requirement of Social Conformity and Limitation of Citizens' Private Freedom

One of the most typical statements of social control by Xenophon appears in his *Cyropaedia* and is carried out by the 'ideal' political leader, Cyrus the Great:

Moreover, we have discovered that he acquired the so-called 'king's eyes (οἱ βασιλέως ὀφθαλμοί)' and 'king's ears (τὰ βασιλέως ὄτια)' in no other way than by bestowing presents and honours; for by rewarding liberally those who reported to him any important news, he prompted many men to make it their business to use their eyes and ears to spy out what they could report to the king to his advantage. As a natural result of this, many 'eyes' and many 'ears' were ascribed to the king. But if anyone thinks that the king selected one man to be his 'eye', he is not right; for one only would see and would hear but little; and it would have amounted to ordering all the rest to pay no attention, if one only had been appointed to see and hear. Besides, if people knew that a certain man was the 'eye', they would know that they must take caution of him. But such is not the case; for the king listens to anybody who may claim to have heard or seen anything worthy of attention. And thus the saying comes about, 'the king has many ears and many eyes'; and people are everywhere afraid to say anything to the discredit of the king, just as if he himself were listening; or to do anything to harm him, just as if he were present. Not only, therefore, would no one have ventured to say anything derogatory of Cyrus to anyone else, but everyone conducted himself at all times just as if those who were within hearing were so many eyes and ears of the king. (Xen. Cyr. 8.2.10-12)

As Pierre Carlier points out, what Cyrus the Great applies here are 'traditional

methods of tyrants'.³⁶¹ It is by no means democratic; and even mild monarchs would avoid such severe intervention in their subjects' freedom. The most striking feature of the system is that the spies serving the king are omnipresent and their numbers are endless. If the system of supervision is effectively established, there would be no secret or privacy left for citizens. The king can know and intervene in everything in social life by his own will. Of course, in the case that the king himself is wise and reasonable, this system would be efficient in elevating morality in social life. But the cost in terms of personal freedom is high; and perhaps not many modern citizens would accept such limits without reluctance.

Similar harsh supervision is also carried out by eunuchs who serve as Cyrus' bodyguards. In an oriental cultural context, the use of eunuchs indicates despotic control of family life; and it seems Xenophon clearly knows about that, but he still commends this institution, though he must be aware fully that this may seem to be strange and barbaric in Greek readers' eyes.³⁶² Anyway, the dark side of Cyrus the Great is already horrible enough: family members inside the royal palace are guarded by eunuchs; and everyone else supervises each other like king's eyes and ears. Obviously, such a scene is not pleasant in the eyes of either modern or classical Athenian readers.

What is more, Cyrus the Great is not the only hero in Xenophon's works who limits citizens' freedom. At least the wise Spartan king Lycurgus does the same thing. Xenophon reports for us in his *Spartan Constitution* as follows:

So that the boys were never left without someone in charge, if the supervisor (ὁ παιδονόμος) went away, he laid it down that any citizen who happened to be present was to be in authority and could order the boys to do whatever seemed appropriate, and could punish them if they did anything wrong. In this way he made the boys more respectful; for neither boys nor men respect anyone so

³⁶¹ Carlier (2010), 357.

³⁶² Gera (1993), 288.

much as those who are in charge. In order that the boys might not be without someone in charge, even when no adult was present, he decreed that the cleverest of the young men of each group should be in charge. Accordingly they are never left unsupervised. (Xen. *Lac.* 2.10-11)

What Xenophon narrates here can be either his fiction or historical facts, of whose reliability we have no way to tell. However, what is important here is that Xenophon obviously appreciates and approves of such acts. In his mind, in order to secure and elevate social morality, one of the most effective methods of social education is to supervise citizens from their childhood on.³⁶³ Xenophon's ideal political leaders would carry it out uncompromisingly, even if that means that citizens' private freedom and privacy would be violated.

If we compare these texts with Xenophon's *Anabasis*, we cannot help doubting that this practice was just what Xenophon adopted in person when he was a leading general in the long march. For in the very beginning of the retreat he suggested to soldiers, 'we must pass a vote that, in case anyone is disobedient, whoever of you may be at hand at the time shall join with the officer in punishing him; in this way the enemy will find themselves mightily deceived; for today they will behold, not one Clearchus, but ten thousand, who will not suffer anybody to be a bad soldier.' (Xen. *An.* 3.2.31)

In sum, three ideal political leaders in Xenophon's different works (Cyrus the Great in the *Cyropaedia*, Lycurgus in the *Spartan Constitution* and Xenophon himself in the *Anabasis*) display similar dark sides by modern standard, as they all mobilise their subjects (or soldiers) to supervise each other and take control of citizens' freedom and privacy. Generally speaking, though other classical Athenian writers, such as Plato and Aristotle, sometimes also advocate for moderate social

³⁶³ In the *Spartan Constitution*, the object of education is mainly confined to children (παῖς) and young men (εἰρήνη), though many moral and social regulations for citizens of all age groups are also introduced. While in his *Cyropaedia*, as he needs to pay far less attention to the historical accuracy and can write much more freely, Xenophon introduces a life-long educational system, which shares a lot of elements with Spartan system but also shows its unique features.

control and conformity in their extant works, the oriental and despotic manner of social supervision is almost always rejected and depicted in a negative way. For instance, Aristotle believes that the despotic way of management in Persian family is unnatural (Arist. *Pol.* 1252b5-9) and totally wrong (Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1160b27-32); and Isocrates criticises sharply the despotic constitution of Persia, in which people 'are subject to one man's power, they keep their souls in a state of abject and cringing fear, parading themselves at the door of the royal palace, prostrating themselves, and in every way schooling themselves to humility of spirit, falling on their knees before a mortal man, addressing him as a divinity, and thinking more lightly of the gods than of men.' (Isoc. *Paneg.* 151) Of course, in Xenophon's ideal polity, a perfect leader can obtain the consent of the governed by his own charisma and virtuous example; but in practice, his art of government is basically monarchy and usually secured by force.³⁶⁴ What is more, in Xenophon's context, these measures to restrict citizens' freedom are consistently tolerated, as long as they can maintain social order and turn it for the better. The similarity indicates that the negative depiction of Cyrus' government after the capture of Babylon does not appear accidentally; it indicates some basic rules hidden in Xenophon's system of moral education.

c. Abuse of Rewards and Violation of Human Dignity

As we can see in the chapters on Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and *Hiero*, proper rewards are important means for good political leaders to encourage moral behaviour. In her monograph on the *Cyropaedia*, Bodil Due argues that such a policy cannot be inspired by Xenophon's Athenian democratic background.³⁶⁵ And generous reward wins for Cyrus the Great the affection and gratitude of people so that they would obey him willingly.³⁶⁶ Nevertheless, Xenophon's political leaders frequently cross

³⁶⁴ Ferguson (1975), 56.

³⁶⁵ Due (1989), 215.

³⁶⁶ Due (1989), 217.

the limit of benevolence³⁶⁷ regulated by the golden mean and turn proper material reward into immoral waste of money and even violation of human dignity in the modern sense.

First of all, the way to obtain wealth for rewarding in Xenophon's description of his heroes is usually immoral in modern readers' eyes. For the fictional Cyrus the Great in the *Cyropaedia*, his financial resource seems to be endless. But for other realistic figures appearing in Xenophon's biographical and historical works, the way to collect money to pay their followers is often problematic and can hardly be moral. In military expeditions recorded by Xenophon, the commonest way to 'reward' soldiers is to allow or even help them to plunder as they wish. Agesilaus is praised by Xenophon because he helped his soldier sell their booty at a fair price; and he was considered as a good general because 'whenever deserters offered to give information where plunder might be taken, they naturally went to the king. In such a case he took care that the capture should be gained by his friends, so that they might make money and enjoy honour at one and the same time. The immediate result was that he had many ardent suitors for his friendship.' (Xen. *Ages.* 1.18-19) Evidently, in practice, even a virtuous general must secure the obedience and friendship of soldiers to him at the cost of the loss of enemies and innocent civilian residents. The whole process of such rewarding is not necessarily clean and glorious in a modern reader's eyes, but Xenophon simply takes it as something praiseworthy in his prose encomium.

In the first book of the *Anabasis*, Cyrus the Younger, another hero admired by Xenophon, also shows no reluctance to reward his soldiers by allowing them to plunder. His habitual practice showed no difference to Agesilaus. For example, when Cyrus the Younger left the territory of Phrygia, he gave over the country of Lycaonia to Greek mercenaries to plunder, on the excuse that it was hostile territory (Xen. *An.* 1.2.19). But sometimes he would even adopt extreme means for his own interest,

³⁶⁷ Azoulay (2004c), 149.

especially when he was short of money. Xenophon hints that Cyrus the Younger only managed to pay his soldiers' salaries by using his intimate relations with Cilician queen Epyaxa (Xen. *An.* 1.2.11-12). But afterwards he did not control his soldiers effectively when they were in Cilicia, and his violent followers plundered thoroughly the city of Tarsus, including the palace in it (Xen. *An.* 1.2.25-27). By committing these crimes, Cyrus the Younger and his soldiers were actually ungrateful for the Cilicians' help and did not mind to add their own gains by any immoral means.

Very similar ethical standard at war is also, to W. Kendrick Pritchett's surprise,³⁶⁸ confirmed by Xenophon's great hero, Cyrus the Great. He encourages his soldiers that 'let not one of you think that in having these things he has what does not belong to him; for it is a law established for all time among all men that when a city is taken in war, the persons and the property of the inhabitants thereof belong to the captors. It will, therefore, be no justice for you to keep what you have, but if you let them keep anything, it will be only out of generosity that you do not take it away.' (Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.73) In sum, in Xenophon's context, plunder is almost always tolerated and serves as an important source for his heroes to reward their followers.

Then what is the purpose of leaders' rewarding? Of course it serves the function of securing followers' loyalty to their masters and leading them towards a moral mode of life. In classical Athenian context, the status of patronage is problematic; on the one hand, the democratic ideology is traditionally hostile to the idea of personal patronage;³⁶⁹ on the other hand, the existence of such behaviours can be well attested in the Athenian democratic society from 462 B.C. down to 322 B.C.³⁷⁰ In that case, Xenophon's approval of personal rewarding seems to be understandable. However, sometimes such favours violate the human dignity of those who receive the rewards. For instance, in the *Oeconomicus*, Ischomachus explains to Socrates that the reason why he rewards his own servants is that those men's natures show no

³⁶⁸ Pritchett (1971), 57.

³⁶⁹ Millett (1989), 17.

³⁷⁰ Millett (1989), 25.

differences from other living creatures such as colts. That is to say, to certain ‘base’ and ‘vulgar’ people (mainly slaves in household), the very aim of master’s reward is to fill their bellies, secure their obedience and deprive all their senses of rational judgment and initiatives. Ischomachus declares with hardly any disguise of courtesy:

And in the case of human beings it is possible to make them more obedient merely by talking to them, pointing out that it is to their advantage to obey. But for slaves the method of training that is accepted for wild animals is very effective in teaching obedience. If you gratify their desires by filling their bellies, you may get a great deal out of them. (Xen. *Oec.* 13.9)

Obviously, Ischomachus does not consider this method decent himself, as he describes it as doing something ‘very easily (φαύλως πάνυ)’ (Xen. *Oec.* 13.4). In the context, we can see that this method is indeed quite easy, as it treats servants simply as animals. Nevertheless, Socrates and Xenophon who composed this dialogue believe this can be tolerated and even praised, as Socrates comments in the dialogue:

Οὐ μὲν δὴ ἄξιόν γ’, ἔφην ἐγώ, τὸ πρᾶγμα καταγέλωτος, ὃ Ἰσχόμαχε. ὅστις γάρ τοι ἀρχικοὺς ἀνθρώπων δύναται ποιεῖν, δῆλον ὅτι οὗτος καὶ δεσποτικοὺς ἀνθρώπων δύναται διδάσκειν, ὅστις δὲ δεσποτικοὺς δύναται ποιεῖν, καὶ βασιλικούς. ὥστε οὐ καταγέλωτός μοι δοκεῖ ἄξιος εἶναι ἀλλ’ ἐπαίνου μεγάλου ὁ τοῦτο δυνάμενος ποιεῖν.

Oh, (I said) but it is certainly not a laughing matter, Ischomachus. For anyone who can make men fit to rule others can also teach them to be masters of others; and if he can make them fit to be masters, he can make them fit to be kings. So anyone who can do that seems to me to deserve high praise rather than laughter. (Xen. *Oec.* 13.5)

Therefore, in Xenophon’s eyes, the art of government, if it can work well and produce positive result, must be valuable and praiseworthy, even though it is sometimes very simple and violent. Ischomachus’ treatment to his servants can be justified as long as such measures bring good order and great wealth to the household.

Again, in the *Cyropaedia*, Cyrus the Great also simply treats his servants as animals. As Xenophon describes:

Those, on the other hand, whom he was training to be servants he did not encourage to practise any of the exercises of freemen; neither did he allow them to take weapons; but he took care that they should not suffer any deprivation in food or drink on account of the exercises in which they served the freemen. (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.43)

As a matter of fact, by such rewards, Cyrus expected to receive from slaves their good will as one does with dogs. During hunting expeditions freemen must go without food, but Cyrus offered food to servants in abundance and earned for himself the title ‘father (πατήρ)’. But, as Deborah Gera justly questions, can any modern reader of the *Cyropaedia* show respect to such a ‘kind’ father and his real intentions when he does not respect his subjects heartily?³⁷¹

What is more, other evidence shows that according to Xenophon’s ethics, this kind of rewarding is equally applicable to freemen, for example mercenary soldiers. And Cyrus the Younger, the able leader he greatly admired, frequently used this art. In order to persuade Clearchus to help him, Cyrus gave him ten thousand darics (Xen. *An.* 1.3.3). When Menon led his soldiers to cross Euphrates ahead of other Greeks, it was said that Cyrus sent magnificent gifts to Menon himself secretly (Xen. *An.* 1.4.16-17). When the Greeks knew Cyrus’ real intention and refused to go any further, Cyrus again rewarded them (Xen. *An.* 1.4.11-13) and persuaded Gaulites, a Samian exile to keep following by a lot of vain promises (Xen. *An.* 1.7.5-8), which nobody would know whether they could be realised at all. In essence, these activities must be taken as some kind of bribes, and their direct purposes are to persuade certain generals to cheat one another in order to secure Cyrus’ own interest, which seems to be quite alien to the method of rewarding described in the *Cyropaedia* (Xen. *Cyr.*

³⁷¹ Gera (1993), 295. Some editors of the text, for example Cobet, believes that the final clause of the text, namely ‘ὅπως ἀναμφιλόγως αἰεὶ ἀνδράποδα διατελοῖεν (so that they may always suffer slavery willingly)’ should be delated. But up to now there is still no convincing evidence for that treatment.

8.2.14) and in the *Hiero* (Xen. *Hier.* 11.13-15) in its ideal form.

To sum up, although the method of rewarding is one of the most important tools for Xenophon's ideal leaders to unify their followers and guide them towards a moral life, it also has a dark side in two aspects of its practice. First of all, the way to obtain 'prizes' for soldiers in military life is often unlawful, violent and dirty, which is hardly compatible with Xenophon's pure philosophical moral teachings set forth elsewhere, for example in the opening passages of the *Cyropaedia* (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.1.1-6) and the ending part of the *Cynegeticus* (Xen. *Cyn.* 12.19-13.18). In the second place, in Xenophon's ethics there seems to be an unseen boundary between 'worthy men' and 'base men' divided by inborn morality (which is difficult to define in a philosophical sense and is never satisfactorily clarified by Xenophon himself in his extant corpus), the latter of whom were made up by lazy slaves and undisciplined mobs. The only proper way to govern such hopeless 'base men' is to fill their bellies as if they were wild animals, by such practice the 'ideal' leaders actually violate basic human dignity which was respected in both modern age and by classical Athenian citizens among themselves.

d. Tricks and Oppressions to Secure Personal Power and Authority

Generally speaking, in Xenophon's context, to deceive a friend, or even an enemy, can be a serious moral fault.³⁷² Nevertheless, his writings also show us clearly that in some circumstance, deceit with dirty tricks is tolerable and can even be regarded as art of government adopted by excellent political leaders.

As set forth, the *Hiero* is a rhetorical dialogue and its purpose is to persuade political leaders to give up tyranny and adopt true kingship so that Xenophon's social education can be carried out. However, one section of this dialogue is surprising and seems to show that Xenophon's 'true kingship' and 'tyranny' are not quite different

³⁷² Xen. *An.* 5.7.5-11; *Symp.* 4.10; *Ages.* 1.11-13; Krentz (2000), 169.

in essence.

At the end of the dialogue, Hiero explained to Simonides that a despot cannot avoid being hated by his subjects because he has many responsibilities and many sensitive decisions to make (Xen. *Hier.* 8.8-10). In reply to that question Simonides answered:

Well, Hiero, I do not deny that all these matters must receive attention. But I should divide a ruler's activities into two classes, those that lead inevitably to unpopularity, and those that are greeted with thanks. The duty of teaching the people what things are best, and of dispensing praise and honour to those who accomplish the same most efficiently, is a form of activity that is greeted with thanks. The duty of pronouncing censure, using coercion, inflicting pains and penalties on those who come short in any respect, is one that must of necessity give rise to a certain amount of unpopularity. Therefore my sentence is that a great ruler should delegate to others the task of punishing those who require to be coerced, and should reserve to himself the privilege of awarding the prizes. The excellence of this arrangement is established by daily experience. (Xen. *Hier.* 9.1-3)

After these discussions, Hiero went on to ask Simonides: 'But what about the mercenaries? Can you tell me how to employ them without incurring unpopularity? Or do you say that a ruler, once he becomes popular, will have no further need of a bodyguard?' (Xen. *Hier.* 10.1) And Simonides answered as follows, 'No, no, he will need them, of course. For I know that the more they get what they want, the more unruly they are apt to become. The way to manage men like that is to put the fear of the bodyguard into them. And as for the good and honourable men (καλοὶ καγαθοί), you can probably confer greater benefits on them by employing mercenaries than by any other means.' (Xen. *Hier.* 10.2-4)

In the two paragraphs above, apart from many common features to the passages on rewarding I have discussed before, we can also find out something unusual and

even ironical for modern readers. On the one hand, Simonides is trying to persuade Hiero to abandon tyranny and adopt ‘true kingship’; while on the other hand, this so-called ‘true kingship’ is still supported by some typical tyrannical arts of government, for example tricks and oppressions.³⁷³ However, Xenophon’s own attitude must be serious instead of ironical. In his mind, a good king should be a combination of a crafty fox and a brutal lion. He reserves glory and praise for himself and forces his intimate followers to take accusations for him. He makes use of violence to tame undisciplined mobs and to serve gentlemen. His ‘ideal’ leader is not ideal in modern standard at all, and sometimes also goes too far to be tolerated in a classical ethical context. Although behaviour like this is sometimes questioned by certain characters in Xenophon’s works (for example Cyrus the Great as a child in the *Cyropaedia* (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.6.27) and Ischomachus in the *Oeconomicus* (Xen. *Oec.* 13.4)), they are always shown afterwards why they are necessary and indispensable (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.6.27; *Oec.* 13.5.). And in his prose encomium of Agesilaus at the latter’s death, Xenophon even openly praises Agesilaus’ skills in deception as follows:

As for the enemy, though they were forced to hate, he gave them no chance to disparage him. For he contrived that his allies always had the better of them, by the use of deception when occasion offered, by anticipating their action if speed was necessary, by hiding when it suited his purpose, and by practising all the opposite methods when dealing with enemies to those which he applied when dealing with friends. Night, for example, was to him as day, and day as night, for he often veiled his movements so completely that none could guess where he was, whither he was going, or what he meant to do. Thus he made even strong positions untenable to the enemy, turning one, scaling another, snatching a third by stealth. (Xen. *Ages.* 6.5-6)

In the case of Lycurgus in the *Spartan Constitution*, Xenophon also describes for us how Lycurgus secures the king’s authority over his people. According to his

³⁷³ Baragwanath (2012), 659.

regulation, Spartan kings should present himself as mortals all their lifetime. For Lycurgus ‘did not want to foster a tyrannical attitude in the kings, nor arouse envy of their power in the citizens’ (Xen. *Lac.* 15.8). Nevertheless, after death, Spartan kings must be honoured by Lacedaemonians as heroes (οἱ ἥρωες), not as men (οἱ ἄνθρωποι) (Xen. *Lac.* 15.9). To some extent this is also one kind of mild trick, as by this measure Spartan kings can achieve a double identity, therefore they can maintain people’s respect to them and their authority due to the divine nature of their ancestry and avoid inciting people’s hatred and jealousy to them in their lifetime as well. Furthermore, in his *Anabasis*, Xenophon ‘consistently portrays Sparta as a power that maintains its authority through compulsion, repeated demands for total obedience, and, consequently, the reduction of its opponents to slavery — literally and figuratively’.³⁷⁴

When we turn to the two Persian kings described by Xenophon, we can see that the uses of tricks and oppressions by them are far more frequent. Cambyses the Elder, the father of Cyrus the Great, taught him that an able military general must be ‘designing and cunning, wily and deceitful, a thief and a robber, overreaching the enemy at every point’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.6.27). Only by performing like this can a monarch become ‘the most righteous and law-abiding man in the world’ (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.6.27). As Jon Hesk comments, according to modern standard, Cambyses’ teaching ‘represents military *apatē* as morally, specially and educationally problematic’ (Xen. *An.* 5.1.14). And Cyrus adopted the advice and made use of tricks and forces both in wars and in daily government in peace time. For instance, when Cyrus the Great decided that he should encourage people to attend the court, he found certain excuses to seize the property of the man who did not present himself and never distributed any favours to him; and he gave those who did attend the easiest and the most profitable employment on purpose (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.1.17-20). He also played tricks in order that he would be proclaimed and ‘forced reluctantly’ by his friends to become

³⁷⁴ Millender (2012), 415.

Persian king, so that 'his public appearances should be rare and solemn and yet excite as little jealousy as possible' (Xen. *Cyr.* 7.5.37). Deborah Gera comments that 'it seems that the Persian ruler thinks that it is not enough for rulers to be better than their subjects; they must bewitch them as well, and making use of the pomp trappings of royal power is one way to ensure that a government will be properly respected'.³⁷⁵ She believes that Cyrus the Great actually used the policies of 'carrot and stick'³⁷⁶ and 'divide and conquer',³⁷⁷ just like modern politicians do when they play dirty. Gabriel Danzig also points out that Cyrus' authority in the *Cyropaedia* is usually secured simply by threat and force.³⁷⁸

As offspring of Cyrus the Great, Cyrus the Younger was equally expert in playing tricks and governing with oppression. He managed to conceal his real aim of the long march until the army arrived at the bank of Euphrates (Xen. *An.* 1.4.11-13). Greek mercenaries, including Xenophon himself, loved Cyrus because he is a generous employer as well as an able military leader. But at the same time they also feared him. As Clearchus said, 'And remember that while this Cyrus is a valuable friend when he is your friend, he is a most dangerous foe when he is your enemy. ... For my part, I should hesitate to embark on the vessels that he might give us, for fear of his sinking us with his warships, and I should be afraid to follow the guide that he might give, for fear of his leading us to a place from which it will not be possible to escape.' (Xen. *An.* 1.3.12-17) In other words, Cyrus the Younger was a crafty and brutal leader who is equally able to benefit his friends generously and to punish them very cruelly when they betray him. The most significant example was his trial of Orontas, a close friend who betrayed him and was caught. After Orontas admitted that he was guilty (Xen. *An.* 1.6.5-10), Cyrus the Younger handed him over to Artapates, the most faithful of Cyrus' chamberlains. Xenophon writes, 'from that moment no man ever saw Orontas living or dead, nor could anyone say from actual

³⁷⁵ Gera (1993), 292.

³⁷⁶ Gera (1993), 293-294.

³⁷⁷ Gera (1993), 294.

³⁷⁸ Danzig (2009), 295.

knowledge how he was put to death, — it was all conjectures, of one sort and another; and no grave of his was ever seen.’ (Xen. *An.* 1.6.10-11) Obviously, such an execution not only punished the betrayer, but also means to warn other followers of Cyrus. After watching the scene of the trial and hearing about the secret execution, they would remain faithful to Cyrus the Younger and work for him, this time no longer for his virtues and charisma, but for fear of his cunning tricks and brutal punishment.

As a historian and witness of many contemporary Persian affairs, Xenophon must know well that tricks and lies are not glorious and extremely negative according to ancient Persian ethical standard. As Steven W. Hirsch points out, ‘the issue of Persian treachery and faithlessness assumes extraordinary significance because “the lie” was the central concept of evil in the Zoroastrian ethical code which underlay Achaemenid Persian culture. To break an oath, to tell a lie, to prove untrustworthy were cardinal sins tolerant under no circumstances, not even when one was dealing with an enemy.’³⁷⁹ In that case, Xenophon’s tolerable attitude to the deeds of the two Persian kings cannot come from any statements of Persian version, but is independently based on his own observation and judgment. While Xenophon describes these plots, his consistent choice of neutral vocabulary³⁸⁰ and tone³⁸¹ shows that he does not take them as something intolerable or unfit for an ideal hero in his mind. Actually, in the *Anabasis*, ‘neither Xenophon nor any other figure ever accuses Cyrus of deceit, wrongdoing, or want of good faith’;³⁸² the case in the *Cyropaedia* for Cyrus the Great is quite similar.

What is more, even in Xenophon’s autobiographical narrative of his own deeds in the *Anabasis*, which mainly serves as an apology of Xenophon himself, we can also recognise certain signs of crafty and despotic characters. When Xenophon rode on horse and led his soldiers to capture a commanding height, his authority was

³⁷⁹ Hirsch (1985), 18.

³⁸⁰ Hirsch (1985), 22-23.

³⁸¹ Hirsch (1985), 23-24.

³⁸² Hirsch (1985), 24.

challenged by a certain Soteridas the Sicyonian, who complained that they were not on equality as common soldiers had to go on foot. Then Xenophon immediately leaped down from his horse, pushed Soteridas out of his place and took his shield. As Xenophon should have expected, such an ‘equal’ gesture restored authority for him. Because other irritated soldiers began to strike and abuse Soteridas and begged Xenophon to remount on his horse again (Xen. *An.* 3.4.46-49). By such a witty method Xenophon managed to preserve his authority and captured the height ahead of his enemies. In another case, when his followers refused to go by land any more, Xenophon pretended to promise that they would go by ship, but he secretly asked cities nearby to repair roads for him, and these preparations were proved to be useful later (Xen. *An.* 5.1.14). Generally speaking, deceit of friends for good purpose is in many cases tolerated in the *Anabasis* and frequently adopted by Xenophon himself. As Xenophon never became the sole commander-in-chief during the long march, his power was limited. But some despotic features were still recognisable in his art of government. For example, when his proposition was opposed by a certain Apollonides in an open discussion at the critical moment for decision, Xenophon rudely interrupted him in the midst of his talk and said, ‘while you can see you still do not perceive, and while you can hear you still do not remember.’ (Xen. *An.* 3.1.26-27) After that, Apollonides was straightly driven out of the conference and Xenophon’s proposition was passed (Xen. *An.* 3.1.31-32). From these statements we can see clearly that Xenophon not only made use of tricks and despotic measures, he also felt it is all right to record them and showed these deeds to the public. Therefore, certain despotic and tyrannical arts of government are actually tolerated and even approved in Xenophon’s ethical system; and in his view, ‘deception is clearly justified when the aim is to accomplish a mutually beneficial distribution against someone’s will.’³⁸³

According to the teaching of Xenophon’s Socrates, pure and sincere friendship

³⁸³ Danzig (2012), 499.

is the most precious possession one can have (Xen. *Mem.* 2.4.1), as Socrates describes:

ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς φίλος ἑαυτὸν τάττει πρὸς πᾶν τὸ ἐλλεῖπον τῷ φίλῳ καὶ τῆς τῶν ἰδίων κατασκευῆς καὶ τῶν κοινῶν πράξεων, καί, ἂν τέ τινα εὔ ποιῆσαι δέη, συνεπισχύει, ἂν τέ τις φόβος ταράττη, συμβοηθεῖ, τὰ μὲν συναναλίσκων, τὰ δὲ συμπράττων, καὶ τὰ μὲν συμπεῖθων, τὰ δὲ βιαζόμενος, καὶ εὔ μὲν πράττοντας πλεῖστα εὐφραίνων, σφαλλομένους δὲ πλεῖστα ἐπανορθῶν. ἃ δὲ αἷ τε χεῖρες ἐκάστω ὑπηρετοῦσι καὶ <οἱ> ὀφθαλμοὶ προορῶσι καὶ τὰ ὦτα προακούουσι καὶ οἱ πόδες διανύτουσι, τούτων φίλος εὐεργετῶν οὐδενὸς λείπεται· πολλάκις ἂ πρὸ αὐτοῦ τις ἢ οὐκ ἐξεργάσατο ἢ οὐκ εἶδεν ἢ οὐκ ἤκουσεν ἢ οὐ διήνυσεν, ταῦτα ὁ φίλος πρὸ τοῦ φίλου ἐξήρκεσεν. ἀλλ' ὅμως ἔνιοι δένδρα μὲν πειρῶνται θεραπεύειν τοῦ καρποῦ ἕνεκεν, τοῦ δὲ παμφορωτάτου κτήματος, ὃ καλεῖται φίλος, ἀργῶς καὶ ἀνειμένως οἱ πλεῖστοι ἐπιμέλονται.

The good friend is on the watch to supply whatever his friend wants for building up his private fortune and forwarding his public career. If generosity is called for, he does his part; if fear harasses, he comes to the rescue, shares expenses, helps to persuade, bears down opposition: he is foremost in delighting him when he is prosperous and raising him up when he falls. Of all that a man can do with his hands, see for himself with his eyes, hear for himself with his ears or accomplish with his feet, in nothing is a friend backward in helping. Nevertheless, while some strive to cultivate a tree for its fruit, most bestow but an idle and listless care on their most fruitful possession, the name of which is 'friend'. (Xen. *Mem.* 2.4.6-7)

Obviously, Xenophon's political leaders are neither prepared to enjoy such kind of ideal friendship, nor do they wish to do such a favour to anybody else. They offer bribery, tell lies and adopt violence to their enemies as well as their friends; and they would oppress and even kill their subjects and followers who betray them in order to secure their own political power and achieve their aims.

In all, I would argue that the dark side of ‘perfect’ political leaders presented in Xenophon’s moral education system is neither accident nor ironical. It reflects certain key features in Xenophon’s outlook and ethical value. The main characters of those ‘dark descriptions’ are as follows:

First and foremost, by modern standard, the ‘dark policies’ of leaders presented by Xenophon interfere with citizens’ freedom and privacy, violate basic human dignity and involve tricks and force rather than honesty and virtues. They show typical characters of despotic and tyrannical governments and therefore can hardly be accepted and approved by anyone in belief of modern values of freedom and equality. As occasional protests and negative comments of Cyrus the Great and Ischomachus show, these measures must also be quite alien and surprising to Xenophon’s contemporary readers, namely those who generally believed in traditional Athenian ethical values.

In the second place, the dark sides of competent political leaders in Xenophon’s works are universal but also hidden. On the one hand, the dark description appears wherever an ideal political leader suitable for moral education is introduced in Xenophon’s extant works. On the other hand, Xenophon never considers it necessary to explain for us exhaustively why the ‘immoral’ dark side exists and why it is tolerable in his utopian social education system, which is carefully devised to elevate morality in the whole society.

Thirdly, the description of these dark sides does cause certain inconsistency and conflicts in Xenophon’s logical system. The purpose of the *Hiero* is to persuade political leaders to choose true kingship instead of tyranny, but the advice of Simonides contains some elements of tyranny itself. In the *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon claims by the mouth of Pheraulas once that human beings are grateful, rational and virtuous in nature, therefore all of them can be educated in moral sense (Xen. Cyr. 8.3.49); while in practice his Cyrus the Great treated slaves and ‘vulgar’ multitudes simply in the way he fed and looked after cattle. Because it is hard to distinguish

citizens and obedient slaves from mobs and lazy slaves in either a philosophical sense or a historical context, and Xenophon fails to offer us an satisfactory measurement anywhere and occasionally uses these prejudiced terms arbitrarily himself, this vague way of classification sometimes causes ambiguity and inconsistency in Xenophon's arguments, which create some 'black holes' and do harm to Xenophon's idea of moral education as a systematic theory in a few cases.

Last but not least, for Xenophon, the adoption of any 'dirty' or immoral measures is still always aimed at the achievement of his ultimate goal, namely the improvement of the moral condition of people through social education. No matter how dark these methods are, their final results are to secure and strengthen a certain virtuous political leader's power and authority; and these political leaders would win victories in battlefield, honour gods and established laws, reward the good and punish the evil, and ultimately benefit his people and elevate the moral standard of the whole society. As the following passage of the *Cyropaedia* clearly shows this:

'By Zeus,' said he, 'there is no easy or simple question that you ask now, my son; but, let me tell you, the man who proposes to do that must be designing and cunning, wily and deceitful, a thief and a robber, overreaching the enemy at every point.'

'O Heracles, father,' said Cyrus with a laugh, 'what a man you say I must become!'

'Such, my son,' he said, 'that you would be at the same time the most righteous and law-abiding man in the world (Οἷος ἄν <ὄν>, ἔφη, ὃ παῖ, δικαιοτάτος τε καὶ νομιμώτατος ἄνθρωπος εἴης).' (Xen. Cyr. 1.6.27)

From this section we can see clearly that the dirty tricks can be and can only be justified when they serve sublime aims in morality. Agesilaus, Cyrus the Great and Xenophon must adopt certain dark measures if they do not want to be killed like Socrates, Cyrus the Younger and Jason of Pherae, as we see in the opening part of this chapter. In order to run a state successfully, both benevolence and despotism are

indispensable.³⁸⁴ In this aspect, Xenophon's notion is deeply influenced by cultural background and his own particular experiences.

III. Background of Xenophon's 'Dark Description' of His Ideal Educators

a. Favour of Rational Social Control among Greek Writers in Late Fifth Century B.C. and Fourth Century B.C.

As an Athenian living in the late fifth century B.C. and the first half of fourth century B.C., Xenophon shares certain common features with his contemporary writers. To some extent, the despotic characters of his political leaders seem to be inspired by contemporary thoughts in favour of rational social control, expressed in many military and political writings of this time as well as proved by the character of the contemporary Greek system of social organisation.

In the military area, one manual written by so-called Aeneas Tacticus³⁸⁵ advocates strict social control, on the ground that many cities are captured because of their inner conflicts. This manual focuses on military activities in Xenophon's mature years (400-360 B.C.³⁸⁶) and mainly discusses how to defend a city effectively. The author suggests that certain forces must be used to keep watch over the citizens (Aen. Tact. 1.3), and these soldiers must be 'both loyal and satisfied with the existing order' (Aen. Tact. 1.5-7). On the other hand, military generals must 'keep an eye on those of the citizens who are disaffected and not be ready to accept their advice.' (Aen. Tact. 11.1) Aeneas Tacticus also points out that in order to prevent citizens from contacting with exiles, 'outgoing and incoming letters shall be brought to censors before being sent out or delivered.' (Aen. Tact. 10.5-8) If some citizens wish to talk to public embassies, 'there must always be present certain of the most trusted citizens who

³⁸⁴ Gera (1993), 296-297.

³⁸⁵ For exhaustive discussion of the nature of this work and its authorship, see Whitehead (1990), 4-7.

³⁸⁶ Members of the Illinois Greek Club (1948), 5.

shall stay with the ambassadors so long as they remain.’ (Aen. Tact. 10.11) He also reminds officers that they must take caution whenever citizens gather together to watch a torch-race, horse-racing or other contests (Aen. Tact. 17.1), because riots tend to break out in such circumstances. These precautions are even more strict and severe than Cyrus the Great’s supervision of his subjects. As a general himself, Xenophon must know about similar situations and perhaps he also read military manuals of such kind. Therefore the idea of social control for military purpose may be quite natural in his mind, and he simply adopts these contemporary military means for the government of his ideal leaders.

Among political writers, both Plato (Pl. *Resp.* 544c) and Aristotle (Arist. *Pol.* 1269a29-36) claim that the constitutions of Sparta and Crete, the two of which are famous for their rigorous social control, are adored by most contemporary critics. Plato sometimes also adopts lying as a way to secure government for good purpose (Pl. *Resp.* 414b-415d). Isocrates summarises the political situation in his time and believes that one-man rule is preferred almost everywhere (Isoc. *Nicocles*, 23). Pseudo-Xenophon, the so-called Old Oligarch whose date is in disputation but may be slightly before Xenophon’s,³⁸⁷ criticises Athenian democracy because it is too tolerant. He complains that Athenians even allow slaves to live luxuriously (Xen. [*Ath.pol.*] 1.10-11); and they pay no attention if rich or noble men are offended by comic mockery and abuse (Xen. [*Ath.pol.*] 2.18). Xenophon’s ideal moral education system, which models Spartan and Persian Constitutions and makes use of both established laws and strict, despotic social control measures, seems to be a response to these ideas and charges.

However, what influenced Xenophon’s education system most must be some existing type of social education. In the *Athenian Constitution*, Aristotle introduces for us one noteworthy institution of social education, which is also featured in

³⁸⁷ The date of the publication of Old Oligarch’s pamphlet is traditionally attributed to 420s. But Simon Hornblower’s relevant paper argues for a fourth-century date, which makes him a contemporary writer with Xenophon. See Hornblower (2000), 363-384.

limitation of personal freedom:

The present state of the constitution is as follows. The franchise is open to all who are of citizen birth by both parents. They are enrolled among the demesmen at the age of eighteen. ... When the youths [Ephebi] have passed this examination, their fathers meet by their tribes, and appoint on oath three of their fellow tribesmen, over forty years of age, who, in their opinion, are the best and most suitable persons to have charge of the youths; and of these the Assembly elects one from each tribe as guardian, together with a director, chosen from the general body of Athenians, to control them all. Under the charge of these persons the youths first of all make the circuit of the temples; then they proceed to Piraeus, and some of them garrison Munichia and some the south shore. The Assembly also elects two trainers, with subordinate instructors, who teach them to fight in heavy armour, to use the bow and javelin, and to discharge a catapult. ... In this way they spend the first year. The next year, after giving a public display of their military evolutions, on the occasion when the Assembly meets in the theatre, they receive a shield and spear from the state; after which they patrol the country and spend their time in the forts. For these two years they are on garrison duty, and wear the military cloak, and during this time they are exempt from all taxes. They also can neither bring an action at law, nor have one brought against them, in order that they may have no excuse for requiring leave of absence; though exception is made in cases of actions concerning inheritances and wards of state, or of any sacrificial ceremony connected with the family. When the two years have elapsed they thereupon take their position among the other citizens. (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 42.1-5)

After reading this text, we can easily recognise a spirit of social control very similar to the 'dark policies' of Lycurgus or Cyrus the Great in Xenophon's works. But some problems remain unsettled, as we do not know the exact date of the origin

of this ephebic institution.³⁸⁸ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff suggests that this institution may have been established in 336/6 B.C. and cannot be dated before 338 B.C.³⁸⁹ His main basis of that assumption is that this institution is not compatible to Athenian democratic spirit and the idea of freedom.³⁹⁰ However, although the earliest formal text of Athenian ephebic oath available³⁹¹ is inscribed in mid-fourth century B.C., its archaic language³⁹² and close relevance to former classical texts³⁹³ seems to suggest an earlier tradition. Therefore, some elements of the ephebic system might already exist before mid-fourth century B.C.³⁹⁴ O.W. Reinmuth believes that ephebic training was still a pure form of military exercise in the first half of the fourth century B.C.³⁹⁵ and developed into the mature form as Aristotle described in 330s. In my opinion, in any case, the appearance of the ephebic institution in its mature form in 330s, which bound individuals and established social system together,³⁹⁶ is already convincing evidence of the general tendency towards rational social control of personal freedom in the development of social regulation in the fourth century B.C.; and other external evidence offered by Aristotle,³⁹⁷ Xenophon and Plato also support this conclusion.

In the chapter on the *Cyropaedia*, we have already observed the similarities between the Persian institution of social education and Athenian ephebic training. Another piece of evidence is provided by Plato's *Laws*.³⁹⁸ In this dialogue, Plato devises one kind of social education carried out by wardens (ἀγρονόμοι) (Pl. *Leg.* 760b-c). These agronomoi are organised by tribes; they can deal with quarrels among neighbours or citizens (Pl. *Leg.* 761d-e); they share common meals and live together;

³⁸⁸ P & d&idiv (1962), 7.

³⁸⁹ Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, (1893), 193-194.

³⁹⁰ P & d&idiv (1962), 9.

³⁹¹ Rhodes and Osborne (2003), 440-443; Lycurgus, *Against Leocrates*, 77.

³⁹² Rhodes and Osborne (2003), 445.

³⁹³ Thuc. 4.144.4; Soph. *Ant.* 663-671; Aesch. *Pers.* 956-962. See Siewert (1977), 104-107.

³⁹⁴ Farenga (2006), 353-354.

³⁹⁵ Reinmuth (1971), 135-136.

³⁹⁶ Farenga (2006), 349.

³⁹⁷ Arist. *Pol.* 1337a21-22; Carlier (2010), 338.

³⁹⁸ P & d&idiv (1962), 25.

they oversee the public and they themselves are also supervised strictly (Pl. *Leg.* 762b-c); they serve the laws and the gods in two years and have to live on simple and humble daily food (Pl. *Leg.* 762e). It is possible that Plato's idea was inspired by ephebic institution or its prototype,³⁹⁹ which further proves that the popularity of the idea of rational control of social education by state in Xenophon's age.⁴⁰⁰

In any case, Athenian ephebic institution and the models of social education controlled by the state devised by Xenophon and Plato indicate a general tendency in the development in Athenian society and elsewhere from a quite early date down to the mid-fourth century B.C. As Chrysis Pélékidis points out, 'L' éphébie attique n'est ni une création du génie athénien, ni l'imitation d'un modèle étranger; c'est l'évolution en Attique d'une institution commune à tous les Grecs.'⁴⁰¹ And its most important feature is that 'it encroached upon the freedom of the individual to order his own life as he wishes in matter of education and of morals.'⁴⁰² In that aspect Xenophon's heroes shared exactly the same character. Their despotic policies regulated social morality in sacrifice of citizens' personal freedom, just as the ephebic institution did for Athenian youths.

In all, the despotic features of ideal political leaders in Xenophon's works are partly the product of his age. In that aspect Xenophon is not quite different from Plato, Aristotle, Old Oligarch and Aeneas Tacticus; and his thought on social education seems also to be influenced by the contemporary ephebic institution or its prototype in the first half of the fourth century B.C.

b. Xenophon's Double Ethical Value Shaped by His Unique Personal Experiences

Unlike Socrates, Plato, Isocrates and Aristotle, who spend most of their lives on

³⁹⁹ The detail he describes, though, is problematic and is likely to be contradictory to historical fact. Relevant discussion can be found in Davis (1965), 28-29.

⁴⁰⁰ However, the origin of Ephebia as a political system is controversial. For challenging opinions, see De Marcellus (1994), 25-26; Friend (2009), 9-10.

⁴⁰¹ Pélékidis (1962), 79.

⁴⁰² Reinmuth (1971), 131.

philosophical or rhetorical studies, Xenophon is a man of action.⁴⁰³ His experience is colourful and unique. He was born in Athens and used to live in Persia, Sparta, Elis and Corinth. He followed Socrates in his youth, but served as a soldier and a general later, and in old age he started to compose all kinds of works and summarise the experience of all his life systematically. Therefore, ‘among classical authors Xenophon’s personal history was exceptional for its combination of Socratic education and the exercise of military leadership in a time of crisis.’⁴⁰⁴ In my opinion, the complex experience can also explain the dark sides and inconsistencies of the ideal images in Xenophon’s mind.

The long march from Babylonia to Asia Minor, during which Xenophon served as a military general, is an extremely hard experience.⁴⁰⁵ The Greek mercenaries’ enemies were cruel, and the Greeks themselves were equally cruel. The Persians cheated those Greek mercenaries by false perjury (Xen. *An.* 2.3.28) and seized almost all their chief leaders (Xen. *An.* 2.5.32). And Greeks even mutilated the bodies of dead Persian soldiers in order to inspire the utmost terror in the enemy (Xen. *An.* 3.4.5). When the Greeks were trapped in heavy snow in Armenia, some soldiers even asked Xenophon to kill them, for they could not go on at all (Xen. *An.* 4.5.15-16). Due to lack of food supplies, the main means by which Greek mercenaries managed to survive is to plunder and to share the booty among themselves.⁴⁰⁶ Xenophon admitted that to his allies, ‘before we became friends of yours, we marched whithersoever we chose through this country, plundering where we wished and burning where we wished.’ (Xen. *An.* 7.7.5)

What is relevant to our subject here is that Xenophon seemed to form one kind of ethical value quite different from Socrates’ moral teaching shown in the *Memorabilia*. For example, when Xenophon reports for us the Greeks’ action in the land of the Carduchians, he tells us that Greeks refrained from harshness because

⁴⁰³ Gish and Ambler (2009), 181.

⁴⁰⁴ Hobden and Tuplin (2012), 39.

⁴⁰⁵ Some scholars describe that the army works like a quasi-polis. See Hornblower (2004a), 244-245.

⁴⁰⁶ Pritchett (1971), 69.

they expected that the Carduchians might help them. But they ‘did take whatever they chanced upon in the way of provisions, for that was necessary’ (Xen. *An.* 4.1.8-9). Therefore, in Xenophon’s mind, the plunder of provision by mercenaries in wars is nothing immoral or shameful. What is more, in order to force soldiers to obey him, it seemed that Xenophon frequently beat them all along the way (Xen. *An.* 5.8.1), and he believed that what he did was just (Xen. *An.* 5.8.13-17). He said in the assembly that, ‘if it was for his good that I punished anyone, I think I should render the sort of account that parents render to sons and teachers to pupils; for that matter, surgeons also burn and cut patients for their good.’ (Xen. *An.* 5.8.18-20) When Xenophon retrospects the march many years later, he comments that the Boeotian general, Proxenus, is a incompetent military general, as as he ‘was not capable of inspiring his soldiers with either respect for himself or fear’ (Xen. *An.* 2.6.19-20). Again, in his *Hiero*, when Hiero complains that a tyrant must be hated as he has to exercise authority over men who are slow to appear for service (Xen. *Hier.* 8.8-9), Simonides, who gives advice on behalf of Xenophon at the moment, agrees that it is a must.⁴⁰⁷ According to Xenophon’s logic, the methods of education can be violent and brutal, as long as its final intention is good, especially when the situation is in emergency. Although Xenophon was a faithful disciple of Socrates all his life, he also formed another system of ethical values in war experiences; therefore his moral value sometimes appears to be inconsistent and contains certain unsolved conflicts.

Another noteworthy fact is that Xenophon’s authority was challenged again and again during the march. Though the Ten Thousand were highly praised by historians in the nineteenth century as ‘a marching democracy’, ‘a roving commonwealth’ or ‘an epitome of Athens set adrift in the center of Asia’,⁴⁰⁸ Xenophon obviously did not think so when he recorded their deeds. He portrayed himself as a good military general and political leader ‘accused unjustly by an ungrateful, envious mob’.⁴⁰⁹

⁴⁰⁷ Christ (2006), 59.

⁴⁰⁸ Brownson (1921), 236-237.

⁴⁰⁹ Azoulay (2004a), 303.

Xenophon took part of the expedition only as a friend of Proxenus (*Xen. An.* 3.1.4). And even after he was elected as general his power had to be shared with others.⁴¹⁰ What is worse, after the mercenaries arrived at the Black Sea coast, they felt that they were safe now and became more and more disobedient.⁴¹¹ Xenophon was at enmity with Meno the Pharsalian (*Xen. An.* 3.1.26-31; *Diog. Laert.* 2.50) and Thorax the Boeotian (*Xen. An.* 5.6.25-26); and he was also accused by agitated soldiers (*Xen. An.* 5.7.1-2) and Dexippus (*Xen. An.* 6.1.32). According to his own narrative, when he abandoned the leadership, his troop immediately became out of control (*Xen. An.* 6.2.4-8), while his intimate friends were still oppressed by private enemies for revenge (*Xen. An.* 6.6.11). These disastrous political experiences, together with the tragic lessons of Socrates, Cyrus the Younger and Jason of Pherae, must have led Xenophon to the conclusion that subject citizens and soldiers are naturally unruly;⁴¹² therefore, political authority should be maintained by all kinds of necessary arts. A successful political leader must learn how to keep his power first, even if that means he has to share certain characters of a despot and accomplish some immoral deeds.

Xenophon talks little about his later military experience after the long march. But in my view, it is quite reasonable to suppose that his ethical values must also be influenced by Agesilaus, his own leader and a living hero he greatly admired. As Diogenes Laertius narrates, after the long march, Xenophon ‘returned to Asia, having enlisted the troops of Cyrus as mercenaries in the service of Agesilaus the Spartan king, to whom he was devoted beyond measure’ (*Diog. Laert.* 2.51). This political leader in real life must influence Xenophon’s image of ideal leadership.

From the beginning of his political career, Agesilaus had to struggle against his enemies in order to hold his own power. Xenophon claims that Agesilaus was chosen as king peacefully for his birth and character (*Xen. Ages.* 1.5). External evidence shows that it is not quite true. According to Plutarch, Agesilaus made an alliance with

⁴¹⁰ Anderson (1974), 128.

⁴¹¹ Whitby (2004), 224.

⁴¹² *Xen. An.* 5.1.14; Hesk (2000), 130.

Lysander, the most prominent Spartan general at that time. And the latter tried his best to gain the title of king for Agesilaus, even by misinterpreting an oracle (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 3.3-5). Finally, Agesilaus was appointed king and inherited the estates of Agis (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 4.1); and his opponent Leotychides was expelled as a bastard. Pausanias also confirms that Lysander was ‘an active supporter of Agesilaus’ and ‘would have him king at all costs’ in the issue of explaining the Delphic oracle on the throne (Paus. 3.8.10). However, though Agesilaus kept friendship with Lysander in the beginning, soon afterwards he realised that the latter was a potential threat to his own power (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 7.1-3). Therefore he ‘resisted the counsels of Lysander, and whatever enterprises were most earnestly favoured by him, these he ignored and neglected, and did other things in their stead’ (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 7.1-3). And finally Lysander complained that Agesilaus knew well how to humble his friends (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 8.1-4). Even after Lysander’s death, Agesilaus still wanted to publish a certain booklet in order to further damage Lysander’s fame (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 20.2-3). These activities are very similar to the measures Xenophon’s ideal leaders adopt to secure their powers.

The historical Agesilaus was also an expert in using tricks. Plutarch writes in his *Life of Agesilaus* that ‘as for those who were in opposition to him, he would do them no open injury, but would show them up if they proved base and grasping in their exercise of authority; then, contrariwise, when they were brought to trial, he would come to their aid and exert himself in their behalf, and so would make them friends instead of enemies, and bring them over to his side, so that no one left to oppose him.’ (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 20.4) According to Diodorus, Agesilaus sometimes held different political opinions with the other king, the youth Agesipolis (Diod. Sic. 15.19.4). In order to control Agesipolis, Agesilaus made use of his hobby of homosexual activity and introduced young boys for him; and he ‘would even lead the young king’s fancy toward the object of his own affections, and share with him in wooing and loving’ (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 2.5-6). There is no doubt that Agesilaus was a

great politician and competent military general; but his dark side was equally vivid. In his *Hellenica* and *Agesilaus*, Xenophon seldom mentions Agesilaus' dark side.⁴¹³ But it is reasonable to suppose that he definitely knew it, and these details inspired him to depict the dark side of his other ideal heroes. In Xenophon's moral philosophy, on the one hand, theoretically, an ideal political leader should be as perfect as what he depicted in most passages of the *Cyropaedia* and the *Hiero*, following the teachings of Socrates, impressing his subjects by his own example and charisma, and benefiting everyone around him benevolently; on the other hand, in actually life and cruel political struggles, a competent leader like Agesilaus or Cyrus the Younger is already good enough, whose despotic manners and crafty tricks must be tolerated. In Xenophon's extant works, these two moral standards coming from very different origins are sometimes in tension with each other. This potential notion must help shape Xenophon's double ethical value system, which, as we can see, is occasionally contradictory in itself and harms the harmony of Xenophon's theory of moral education.

IV. Conclusion

In conclusion, a certain dark side does exist in Xenophon's depiction of ideal political leaders and the social education of morality carried out by them. These dirty policies sometimes limit the freedom of citizens by social control, purchase human dignity by wealth taken from plunder, secure established authority by tricks and violence rather than by virtues and love. These notions show some common features of Greek thoughts and social realities in late fifth century B.C. and fourth century B.C. in favour of rational social control and reign of lawful kingship; but they are also partly the product of Xenophon's own unique experience and his double ethical

⁴¹³ Sometimes, though, Xenophon would admit that Agesilaus did play tricks in wars. Cf. Xen. *Ages.* 1.25-34. He also describes Spartan army's extremely strict discipline in his *Lac.* 11.1-13.11, which may still be used by Agesilaus in his expeditions.

values shaped by both Socratic moral philosophy and Persian and Spartan ideologies in real life. These dark descriptions are not always pleasant for modern readers to read, but they are of great importance for us to study the pragmatic and realistic aspect of Xenophon moral education system.

Anyway, Xenophon should be praised for his sincerity as a researcher of human soul and historical facts. If he wishes to keep his ideal heroes' images perfect, he does not have to mention the dark side of Cyrus the Great, Cyrus the Younger, Lycurgus and especially his own image in the *Anabasis* at all. But he does not omit these details, even though they may not be pleasant for his contemporary readers to read. And Xenophon's faithful record of historical details and close observation of human nature ensure his popularity from the Roman age to the modern era.

The admission of the existence of a dark side of political life also reflects Xenophon's optimistic outlook⁴¹⁴ and attitude. Unlike some utopian writers who hold childish illusions of political life and pessimistic priests who lay all their hopes of salvation on the mercy of gods, Xenophon holds firmly the belief that although politics is cruel and dirty in reality, it can still serve to improve our living condition and moral standard, on condition that it is guided by rational and philosophical mind toward the ultimate supreme good. Xenophon himself was an unfortunate exile and unsuccessful military general in large part of his life, but he never doubted that gods would bless human beings as long as they remain pious, lawful, virtuous and manage their own affairs properly and rationally, and he never gave up the effort of looking for the best way leading to happiness and morality in the actual political life full of violence, evil and tricks.

The courage to reveal and deal with the dark side in his system of morality also shows that Xenophon was a man of action. As Eunapius comments, 'Xenophon, the philosopher, is unique among all philosophers in that he adored philosophy not only with words, but with deeds as well.' (Eunap. VS. 452.) He is not satisfied to discuss

⁴¹⁴ Parker (2004), 132.

his idea of social education only in the sense of moral philosophy and metaphysics, but also wishes to put the theory into practice and examine whether it can work well in actual political life. In that sense Xenophon does display his uniqueness among classical writers. His attempt to establish a more rational practice of political leadership⁴¹⁵ was noticed and made use of by Machiavelli⁴¹⁶ and other humanists, and therefore indirectly contributed to the birth of modern political thought and social science.

⁴¹⁵ Danzig (2012), 499.

⁴¹⁶ Nadon (1996), 362.

Chapter 4: A Supplement to Political Education of Social Morality: The Primitive Model of Moral Economics Established in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* and *Poroi*

I. An Unexpected Question: Has Xenophon Changed His Mind?

In the three chapters above, we have examined the main contents of Xenophon's system of social education of morality organised by ideal political leadership. This kind of education is carried out by an ideal, almost perfect political leader and leads to ultimate happiness, as specified by Socratic moral philosophy, for his people. We see that Xenophon tries, in some highly rhetorical works such as the *Hiero*, to persuade political leaders and other readers in real life to adopt his advice. In order to carry out this philosophical and utopian plan against the harsh historical background of the Greek world in the early fourth century B.C., certain dark features (violence, strict control, dishonesty, physical punishment) and 'immoral' tricks are tolerated and sometimes even approved by Xenophon's double moral standard. Up to now, in spite of confusion and tension in few certain details, the model of moral education presented by Xenophon seems to be generally uniform and systematic. Nevertheless, the preface of the *Poroi*, one short treatise or oration on the revenue of Athens⁴¹⁷ traditionally attributed to Xenophon without much dispute,⁴¹⁸ appears to overthrow what he established before and suggest something new:

Ἐγὼ μὲν τοῦτο ἀεὶ ποτε νομίζω, ὅποιοί τινες ἂν οἱ προστάται ᾧσι, τοιαύτας καὶ τὰς πολιτείας γίνεσθαι. ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν Ἀθήνησι προεστηκότων ἔλεγόν τινες ὡς γιγνώσκουσι μὲν τὸ δίκαιον οὐδενὸς ἥττον τῶν ἄλλων ἀνθρώπων, διὰ δὲ τὴν τοῦ πλῆθους πενίαν ἀναγκάζεσθαι ἔφασαν ἀδικώτεροι εἶναι περὶ τὰς πόλεις, ἐκ

⁴¹⁷ Ober (2008), 250-251.

⁴¹⁸ Schorn (2011), 65.

τούτου ἐπεχείρησα σκοπεῖν εἴ πῃ δύναιντ' ἂν οἱ πολῖται διατρέφεσθαι ἐκ τῆς
ἐαυτῶν, ὅθενπερ καὶ δικαιοτάτον, νομίζων, εἰ τοῦτο γένοιτο, ἅμα τῇ τε πενίᾳ
αὐτῶν ἐπικεκουρῆσθαι ἂν καὶ τῷ ὑπόπτους τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν εἶναι.

For my part I have always held that the constitution of a state reflects the character of the leading politicians. But some of the leading men in Athens have stated that they recognise justice as clearly as other men; 'but,' they have said, 'owing to the poverty of the masses, we are forced to be somewhat unjust in our treatment of the cities.' This set me thinking whether by any means the citizens might obtain food entirely from their own soil, which would certainly be the fairest way, I felt that, were this so, they would be relieved of their poverty, and also of the suspicion with which they are regarded by the Greek world. (Xen. *Vect.* 1.1)

The *Poroi* is only a minor work of Xenophon and seldom attracts the attention of either ancient critics⁴¹⁹ or modern scholars;⁴²⁰ and Xenophon's economic ideas, mainly expressed in his *Poroi* and the *Oeconomicus*, are much criticised in Moses Finley's classic work on ancient economy;⁴²¹ most of these proposals, for example the ingenious advocacy⁴²² of state action to exploit the mines, are perhaps not adopted by the contemporary Athenian government at all.⁴²³ Nevertheless, its opening part cited above appears to be a serious and unexpected challenge to the fundamental basis of Xenophon's moral education, one of his favourite topics and core of his whole thought, and is therefore noteworthy for the purpose of this dissertation. It is 'unexpected' in two aspects. First of all, as a concise and highly technical work on the revenue of Athens,⁴²⁴ the *Poroi* should not have much to do with morality. As a matter of fact, Xenophon's subject in the preface is not moral

⁴¹⁹ Austin and Vidal-Naquet (1977), 146.

⁴²⁰ Gauthier (2010), 113.

⁴²¹ Finley (1999), 19.

⁴²² Michell (1957), 109.

⁴²³ Michell (1957), 97, 389.

⁴²⁴ The title of the *Poroi* in the oldest manuscript, Ξενοφῶντος πόροι ἢ περὶ πρόσδοων, might be added by later scribes, just like the case of his *Apology* and *Hiero*. Nevertheless, it summarises the content of this work quite well. See Gauthier (1976), 7.

education, but the economic relationship between Athens and its allies under the second Athenian Empire. However, in this very short passage, two central concepts of Xenophon's moral education, 'the leading politicians (οἱ προστάται)' and 'justice (τὸ δίκαιον)' are mentioned. Following the typical logic of Xenophon, which we can find again and again in his other writings, a reader would naturally expect that Xenophon's solution is to ask the leaders to make good use of their art of leadership and treat Athenian allies justly. But what follows seems to hint that it is impossible to establish justice when the people under the competent leaders (who 'recognise justice as clearly as other men', though not necessarily as perfect as Cyrus the Great in Xenophon's utopian regime) lived in poverty, because in that case Athens has to harm her friends and exploit people living in other cities in order to acquire wealth elsewhere, then make wars against them ceaselessly and sacrifice the peaceful life of her own people, that is to say to maintain her power by unjust means and to lead her people to injustice, violence and misery. Therefore, Xenophon has to search for something different (in this case certain economic means) beyond ideal political leadership to deal with this 'moral crisis' instead.

In the second place, the *Poroi* is not only one work of Xenophon that can be roughly dated (which is very rare in Xenophon's corpus), but is also quite certain to be the last writing Xenophon composed shortly before his death.⁴²⁵ The date of the *Poroi* and the date of Xenophon's death seem to be very close. In 4.40 Xenophon mentions 'the late war', which must be the so-called 'Social War' (a revolt of Athenian allies against the oppression of Athens) taking place from 357 to 355 B.C.⁴²⁶ This can perfectly explain why Xenophon chooses to connect the topics of revenue to friendship with allies of Athens. Therefore, the *Poroi* is likely to be delivered or composed shortly after that between 355 and 354 B.C.⁴²⁷ In the case of Xenophon's date of death, most modern scholars agree that Xenophon died in his

⁴²⁵ Gauthier (1976), 1.

⁴²⁶ Dillery (1993), 1.

⁴²⁷ Gauthier (2010), 113.

seventies in 355 or 354 B.C.⁴²⁸ Therefore, many researchers believe that the *Poroi* must be the last work of Xenophon;⁴²⁹ E.C. Marchant even guesses that Xenophon ‘probably died a few months after writing it’.⁴³⁰ For a prolific writer in cultural history, his later works usually serve as summary and conclusion of his thought system produced in his mature years. But Xenophon appears to overthrow what he established before in the *Poroi*, which is quite unusual and should be treated seriously.

Nevertheless, when we read Xenophon’s works, especially the usually highly rhetorical openings and endings, we should not forget that Xenophon is frequently mentioned as ‘the orator Xenophon’ in later manuscripts.⁴³¹ We have already seen his skilful mastery of rhetorical techniques in the *Hiero*. The general style of the *Poroi* is also ‘surprisingly rhetorical’⁴³² and characteristic of deliberative oratory.⁴³³ In my opinion, the preface of the *Poroi* serves as another example of the use of rhetorical skills in order to draw the audience’s close attention to ‘something new’. After close examination, I would argue that Xenophon’s economic view is actually a supplement of his traditional mode of moral education and is generally compatible with the ideal leadership. If we take Xenophon’s two works dealing with the economic sphere, namely the *Poroi* and the *Oeconomicus*⁴³⁴ together, we would see clearly that though certain innovations and developments of thought do take place, what Xenophon manages to establish is actually a kind of ‘moral economics’ in its

⁴²⁸ Christopher J. Tuplin supposes that Xenophon was born around 430 B.C. (Tuplin (2003), 1628) but seems to be uncertain about his date of death; Eckart E. Schütrumpf sets Xenophon’s years of birth and death at about 430-354 B.C. (Schütrumpf (2003), 633); and Laurence Villard makes them around 427-355 B.C. (Villard (2005), 2269). The unreliable date of Xenophon’s death provided by Diogenes Laertius (360-359 B.C., which is cited from the list of archons and Olympic victors recorded by Ctesiclides of Athens, see Diog. Laert. 2.56) is almost rejected by all.

⁴²⁹ Dillery (1993), 10.

⁴³⁰ Marchant (1925), xxv.

⁴³¹ Strauss (1963), 25.

⁴³² Jansen (2007), 60.

⁴³³ Jansen (2007), 70.

⁴³⁴ In this thesis, I mainly take the *Oeconomicus* (whose date is uncertain but must be earlier than that of the *Poroi*) as one atypical Socratic dialogue which attempts to introduce his theory of social education into the domestic sphere, as my Chapter 2 of Part 3 will show. Nevertheless, I also believe that Xenophon’s narrative of both improper and suitable domestic management in the *Oeconomicus* reflects the economic ideas he held before his composition of the *Poroi*. Therefore, it is useful to study both the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi* in this chapter so as to to reconstruct Xenophon’s moral economics and the process of its development.

primitive stage based on Socratic philosophy and his own device of ideal leadership, which serves to support and enrich his doctrine of moral education. Though Xenophon never had a chance to polish this idea further due to his immediate death following the composition of the *Poroi*, it still comprises a unique and noteworthy element in Xenophon's works as well as in the history of Greek thought in the classical period.

II. Consistency between Xenophon's Economic Proposal and his System of Moral Education under Ideal Leaders

First of all, according to Xenophon's view showed in both the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi*, proper management of agricultural production and financial affairs is one of the most important responsibilities of ideal political leaders. In the *Oeconomicus*, when Critobulus asks who should be responsible for bad management of domestic affairs, which is mainly economic, Socrates answers him as follows:

Whenever a sheep is in a bad way, we usually blame the shepherd, and whenever a horse is vicious, we usually find fault with its rider. As for a wife, if she manages badly although she was taught what is right by her husband, perhaps it would be proper to blame her. But if he doesn't teach her what is right and good and then discovers that she has no knowledge of these qualities, wouldn't it be proper to blame the husband? (εἰ δὲ μὴ διδάσκων τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ ἀνεπιστήμονι τούτων χρῆτο, ἅρ' οὐ δικαίως ἂν ὁ ἀνὴρ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχοι;) (Xen. *Oec.* 3.11-12)

From this passage we can see clearly that the husband, the highest 'leader' of the οἶκος, must teach (διδάσκων) his 'followers' (in this case his wife and servants) 'what is right and good (τὸ καλὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν)' in order to run domestic and economic affairs (agricultural production, financial income, etc.) well. In that sense, the husband is acting in the same way as Cyrus the Great fosters morality among his

subjects. The similarity shows the correspondence between the public and private spheres in Xenophon's outlook, which will be discussed in detail in my chapter on queen bee metaphor. What we need to do here is to recognise the similar roles played by competent leaders in economic affairs and in maintenance and improvement of social morality.

As we can expect, after some divergent discussions on different occupations, Xenophon's Socrates soon returns to his favourite topic: the critical role played by ideal political leaders in management of affairs. And this time he explains the responsibilities of good Persian kings in agricultural production exhaustively. He says, 'Surely we ought not to be ashamed to imitate the king of the Persians? For people say that he classifies farming and the art of war among the noblest and most essential concerns; and he is seriously concerned about both of them.' (Xen. *Oec.* 4.4-5) In the following statements, Socrates claims that Cyrus the Great paid great attention to make sure that the good lands of Persians are well cultivated (Xen. *Oec.* 4.8-9); he asked all his satraps to take care of military and agricultural matters equally (Xen. *Oec.* 4.11); Cyrus the Younger even planted trees with his own hands and was praised by an astonished Lysander for that (Xen. *Oec.* 4.20-25). What is striking is that Xenophon's Socrates seems to draw a connection between the loyalty of Cyrus' followers at his death and his emphasis on the importance of agriculture (Xen. *Oec.* 4.18-19), which is very difficult for modern readers to understand. Perhaps Xenophon's original intention is only to show that valour in battlefield and diligence in organisation of agricultural production are both indispensable contributions to the formation of the perfect and glorious image of Cyrus the Younger as an able political leader. In any case, it is undisputable that Xenophon does express the idea here that an ideal political leader not only teaches his people loyalty to himself, piety to gods, obedience of authority, respect of social manners as well as many other moral characters leading to a virtuous way of life, but can also supervise them to carry out agricultural production successfully so that they can feed

and enrich themselves to enjoy economic prosperity in happiness.⁴³⁵

A third passage of the *Oeconomicus* discusses the function of good laws in agricultural production. Ischomachus tells Socrates that he adopts certain articles in the laws of Draco, Solon and Persian kings to reward and punish his servants to ensure that they would work hard (Xen. *Oec.* 14.3-7). In the context of Greek culture, the laws of Draco and Solon stands for wise legislation;⁴³⁶ and this is also an important responsibility of a good political leader. In sum, although the subject of the *Oeconomicus* is mainly economic, the responsibility for agricultural production discussed in it is still taken by competent political leaders. Through experienced instructions on management, emphasis on agriculture and wise legislation, a good political leader, such as Cyrus or Solon, is able to make full use of labourers' potential strength and run the agricultural economy well.

Does the *Poroi*, then, present totally different advice? In my opinion it is not quite the case. Of course, in the background of Athenian democracy, Xenophon has to replace his Cyrus the Great with 'the leading politicians' (though they are only competent at most and not as ideal as the former) and replace subjects with Athenian people and their allies. But in other aspects little is changed. After explaining his advice on how to increase the income of Athens, Xenophon concludes that 'now such additions to our revenues as these cost us nothing whatever beyond benevolent legislation and measures of control (ψηφίσματα τε φιλόανθρωπα καὶ ἐπιμελείας)' (Xen. *Vect.* 3.6). In another passage, Xenophon also suggests that Athenian government should organise the exploration of new resources by the unit of tribes, and take control of the discovered wealth so that the wealth found by one tribe only should benefit everyone (Xen. *Vect.* 4.30-31). This is also a political measure to deal with economic demands and has to be carried out by politicians only.

If we read the *Poroi* carefully, we can easily see that none of Xenophon's advice

⁴³⁵ This idea might come from Persian/Zoroastrian ideology. See Pomeroy (1994), 253.

⁴³⁶ Pomeroy (1994), 319.

on revenue is designed to admonish Athenian people to give up luxurious life in order to save money, to teach artisans how to improve productivity by innovative techniques, or to ask Athenian and metic merchants to donate for public benefits. Most of his advice is for Athenian politicians, in the hope that they can improve the financial condition by wise legislation, rational social control and maintenance of peace and order instead of wars and exploitations against their own allies. As Joseph Nicholas Jansen points out, 'Xenophon does not aim to persuade the entire Athenian citizenry straight away with his exposition but rather those who would introduce his proposals to the assembly as specific motions'.⁴³⁷ This idea is perfectly compatible with what Xenophon wrote in the *Cyropaedia* and other works for ideal leadership and serves as a supplement in the economic aspect of Xenophon's theory of the art of government.

In the second place, the economic content presented in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* and *Poroi* is not something irrelevant to the sphere of morality. As A.J. Bowen comments in the introduction to his edition of Xenophon's *Symposium*, Xenophon's interests are in manners and morals instead of something more narrowly intellectual.⁴³⁸ This rule is equally applicable to his two works on economic matters.

In the *Oeconomicus*, Socrates explains to Critobulus the use of farming. He says, 'I am telling you this because not even those most favoured by the gods can do without farming. For concerning oneself with it seems to be simultaneously a pleasant experience, a means of increasing one's estate, and exercise for the body so that it may be capable of all those things that are suitable for a free man.' (Xen. *Oec.* 5.1) He then summarises the benefit of agricultural production with a series of rhetorical questions:

And what occupation makes men more suited for running, throwing, and jumping than farming? What occupation provides greater pleasure in return to

⁴³⁷ Jansen (2007), 97.

⁴³⁸ Bowen (1998), 2.

those who work at it? What occupation welcomes the man who is concerned with it more graciously, inviting him to come and take what he needs? What occupation welcomes friends more generously? Where is it more comfortable to spend the winter than on a farm with a generous fire and warm baths? Where is it more pleasant to spend the summer than in the countryside with streams and breezes and shade? What other occupation provides more appropriate first-fruits for the gods or produces festivals with a greater abundance of offerings? What occupation is more popular with slaves, or sweeter to a wife, or more attractive to children, or more agreeable to friends? I think it would be remarkable if any free man has ever come to possess any property more pleasant than a farm, or has discovered any object of concern more pleasant or more useful for making a living. Furthermore, because the earth is divine, she teaches justice to those who have the ability to learn from her. She gives the greatest benefit in return to those who cultivate her best. (Xen. *Oec.* 5.8-12)

The sense of moral teaching is rather explicit in these comments. In Xenophon's view, on the one hand, farming is useful because it provides the necessary supply of food and other resources, with which one can live properly as a free man; yet, on the other hand, physical labour in economic activities is also useful as a form of moral education. It offers the opportunity for one to do exercise and to strengthen the body; it enriches one's soul by the pleasure of harvest; it creates and enhances close friendship among labourers; and it helps men realise justice existing in harmony with nature. Therefore, by encouraging and giving proper instructions to agricultural labourers, as well as setting an example for them by taking part in agricultural activities themselves, the two Cyruses and other ideal political leaders not only increase the wealth of the society, but also create opportunities for their people to receive social education and to improve their morality.

Although Xenophon mentions nothing about pleasure, friendship or moral virtues obtained from physical labours any more in his *Poroi* (which are obviously

unsuitable for the situation), as he does in the *Oeconomicus*, he does talk about something else connected with morality in this work, which is the proper use of wealth. As one leading scholar on Xenophon's *Poroi*, Philippe Gauthier, argues, Xenophon hints that the extra wealth gathered by the means that he advocates should be used to encourage the Athenian people to make a larger contribution to their state by taking part in public assemblies as *homo politicus* should;⁴³⁹ and the ultimate aim of Xenophon's plan is to eliminate the 'poverty of the masses' with 'τροφή of the demos'⁴⁴⁰ gained by his financial measures in order to support the maintenance and development of the Athenian democratic system and the citizens' political virtues.

Due to the lack of external evidence, it is very difficult to tell whether Gauthier's interpretation is absolutely correct in detail; however, the moral value of wealth gained from economic activities in Xenophon's *Poroi* is quite clear. As Isocrates did in his famous pamphlet *On the Peace*,⁴⁴¹ which had just been composed in 355 B.C., Xenophon also advocates peace and justice in his *Poroi*. However, unlike Isocrates, who tries to persuade Athenians to adopt his advice as policy by means of rhetoric and historical examples,⁴⁴² Xenophon attempts to find a solution to the fundamental social problem which causes wars and oppressions in his eyes — the general poverty of Athenian people.⁴⁴³ According to Xenophon's plan, if sufficient wealth can be collected by rational management of revenue and explorations of new financial resources, plundering wars and unjust oppression of Athenian allies can be avoided. As he describes,

It [a board of guardians of peace] would help to increase the popularity of the city and to make it more attractive and more densely thronged with visitors from

⁴³⁹ Cawkwell (1979), 18.

⁴⁴⁰ Gauthier (2010), 131.

⁴⁴¹ Marchant (1925), xxvii-xxviii.

⁴⁴² The main aim of Isocrates' economic plan is to reform the way of redistribution of wealth and to restore the balance and harmony between the rich and the poor in Athenian society, which existed in the remote past. Relevant analysis can be found in Fuks (1984), 54-57, 60, 67.

⁴⁴³ Due to scarceness of relevant historical evidence, it is impossible to know whether Xenophon's diagnosis of contemporary Athenian society is to the point. But it is evident that Xenophon presents in the *Poroi* a different perspective from that of Plato and Isocrates, which is more utilitarian and means to be practical.

all parts. ... I presume that those states are reckoned the happiest (εὐδαιμονέσταται) that enjoy the longest period of unbroken peace; and of all states Athens is by nature most suited to flourish in peace. For if the state is tranquil, what class of men will not need her? Ship-owners and merchants will head the list. Then there will be those rich in corn and wine and oil and cattle; men possessed of brains and money to invest; craftsmen and professors and philosophers; poets and the people who make use of their works; those to whom anything sacred or secular appeals that is worth seeing or hearing. Besides, where will those who want to buy or sell many things quickly meet with better success in their efforts than at Athens? (Xen. *Vect.* 5.1-4)

From this passage, we can see that the purpose of Xenophon's revenue plan is also partly moral. First, its direct intention is to avoid cruel violence and oppression against Athenian allies in the future. Second, unbroken peace can also contribute to further economic prosperity and development of cultural education in the form of philosophy and poetry, and finally leads to the ultimate happiness in the sense of Socratic moral philosophy. On the other hand, peace on the basis of wealth and popularity is also based on the principle of justice and not simply achieved at the cost of surrender and sufferings on the part of Athens' enemies, because 'our vengeance would follow far more swiftly on our enemies if we provoked nobody by wrong-doing; for then they would look in vain for an ally' (Xen. *Vect.* 5.13). As Christopher J. Tuplin points out, the main aim of the *Poroi* is to establish 'a new imperialism based on peace and consensual hegemony'.⁴⁴⁴ And this plan is closely relevant to the concepts of justice, voluntary obedience and happiness discussed in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* and other works on moral education.

To sum up, the examination of the texts of the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi* shows that Xenophon never abandoned his fundamental model of moral education carried out by political leadership. The rational economic activities described by

⁴⁴⁴ Tuplin (2003), 1631.

Xenophon are organised and supervised by competent political leaders; their practice and final aim are full of moral sense and reflect Xenophon's lifelong ideas on morality. To some extent, the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi* serve as two supplements to the model of the ideal society created and maintained by good leadership and Socratic moral guideline in the *Cyropaedia* and fill up the blank space of the economic life in this utopian regime.

III. Innovations of Xenophon's *Poroi* and the Formation of his Moral Economics in its Primitive Stage

In both the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi*, the two crucial elements in the model of moral education presented in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, the ideal leadership and Socratic morality, do exist and play important roles. This fact shows clearly that there are no fundamental changes in Xenophon's thought system. On the other hand, the claim of his change of mind in the opening part of his *Poroi* still makes sense, as this work shows two dramatic new features which mark the transition and development of Xenophon's interest in social morality.

The first and quite obvious change is that Xenophon now prefers to focus on Athens' contemporary situation instead of those remote, usually exotic, and sometimes utopian worlds he described in the *Cyropaedia*, the *Anabasis*, the *Spartan Constitution*, the *Symposium* and the *Memorabilia*, and so on. In contrast to all these writings, the *Poroi* shows that Xenophon focused his attention on Athens and did care about new events taking place there,⁴⁴⁵ though he may still have stayed in Corinth until his death, if we accept Diogenes Laertius' report as truth (Diog. Laert. 2.56). He expresses freely his love and hope for Athens, which must be refrained during his long career of exile. He claims that Athens is 'by its nature capable of furnishing ample revenue' (Xen. *Vect.* 1.2). He praises the diversity of plants (Xen.

⁴⁴⁵ Bowen (1998), 3-4.

Vect. 1.3), of mineral resources (Xen. *Vect.* 1.4-5), and the mildness of climate of Attica (Xen. *Vect.* 1.6-8). As John Dillery points out, the writing style of the *Poroi* ‘invokes the language of Athenian imperial ideology’;⁴⁴⁶ and the author also ‘confines himself rigidly to proposals of a practical nature’.⁴⁴⁷ The burst of patriotic passion and the strong interest for his fatherland must have something to do with Xenophon’s personal experience. According to Diogenes Laertius’ account, in Xenophon’s last years, the Athenians passed a decree to assist Sparta, and Xenophon immediately sent his sons to Athens to serve the army in defence of Sparta (Diog. Laert. 2.53). These facts seem to mean that Xenophon managed to make conciliation with Athenian politicians and was prepared to end his career by returning to Athens himself again. Although perhaps Xenophon never had a chance to return from Corinth before his death,⁴⁴⁸ the sincere love of his fatherland expressed in his final work is admirable, and the *Poroi* is noteworthy as an adapted version of Xenophon’s theory of leadership and moral education designed to deal with the current urgent financial crisis in Athens and his last effort to contribute to his fatherland.⁴⁴⁹

An even more important feature of the *Poroi* is that Xenophon publicly recognises the knowledge of the accumulation of wealth as a form of moral virtue in this work. This idea was already hinted at in Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* and was further developed in his *Poroi*.

As an Epicurean philosopher and author of a work titled *Oeconomia*, Philodemus questions in his highly fragmentary comment on Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* that he cannot understand why a moral philosopher like Socrates would pay any attention to the practical acquisition of wealth at all (Philodemus, *Oeconomia*, 6.1-20). But it seems that Philodemus did not understand Xenophon’s basic meaning correctly. According to Xenophon’s view in the *Oeconomicus*,

⁴⁴⁶ Dillery (1993), 2-3.

⁴⁴⁷ Marchant (1925), xxvii.

⁴⁴⁸ While it is equally possible that Xenophon did return to Athens from time to time in his final years. See Hobden and Tuplin (2012), 1.

⁴⁴⁹ As a matter of fact, though Xenophon is an admirer of Sparta and her constitution, it seems that it does not affect his loyalty to his fatherland and her ideology. See Seager (2001), 396-397; Dillery (1993), 1-6.

agricultural labour does offer many opportunities for the improvement of labourers' moral characters, as we have seen clearly in the section above. What is more, I believe Xenophon actually attempts to justify his positive opinion on the value of the proper use of material wealth even further by developing some traditional Greek ideas (Solon, 4.10-16 (in Gerber); Bacchyl. 3.10-14 (in Snell)) beyond moral philosophy.

In the *Oeconomicus* 1.7-10, Socrates helps Critobulus to realise that property actually means something one possesses (Xen. *Oec.* 1.7). Therefore, a rider who fails to tame his horse cannot count the horse as his property (Xen. *Oec.* 1.8); a land which fails to provide food cannot be taken as a farmer's property (Xen. *Oec.* 1.8); and a shepherd who is ignorant of how to deal with sheep does not really hold those sheep as his own wealth (Xen. *Oec.* 1.9). Finally, Socrates summarises:

Things that are the same, then, can be wealth for the person who knows how to use each of them, but not wealth for one who does not know. (Xen. *Oec.* 1.10)

This idea comprises the first argument in favour of the art of creating wealth. Everything, including wealth and land, is useless and even harmful if the owner does not know how to make use of it properly at all. In that case, the knowledge of agriculture is something as valuable as traditional Socratic concepts of moral values, such as moderation and thrift, as all of them contribute to happiness and improvement of living conditions. On the other hand, the abandonment of making use of land and other wealth is not only a pity, but can be an evil or crime in moral sense, because it means waste of the potential value of wealth. On the basis of that supposition, Xenophon's Socrates soon reveals for us the second point of this argument. Critobulus mentions that many people are expert at certain skills, but they do not want to make use of them because they have no masters (Xen. *Oec.* 1.16-17). Socrates immediately corrects him and points out that these people do have masters, who are all kinds of pains disguised as pleasures (Xen. *Oec.* 1.19-20). Then Socrates criticises:

And these, too, are slaves, and they are ruled by extremely harsh masters. Some are ruled by gluttony, some by fornication, some by drunkenness, and some by foolish and expensive ambitions which rule cruelly over any men they get into their power, as long as they see that they are in their prime and able to work; so cruelly indeed, that they force them to bring whatever they have earned by working and to spend it on their desires. But when they perceive that they are unable to work because of age, they abandon them to a wretched old age and they try to use others as their slaves, in turn. But Critobulus, we must constantly fight for our freedom against these influences even more than against armed men trying to enslave us. (Xen. *Oec.* 1.22-23)

Following the conclusion of this passage, Xenophon's Socrates further argues here that if anyone does understand the skill of enriching himself, he has the responsibility to put it into practice in real life. Whoever fails to do that is described as a slave under cruel masters, and their 'idleness and moral weakness and carelessness' are defined as evil vices. And it is quite noteworthy that, instead of being connected with luxurious life and extravagant spending of money, the art of increasing one's own wealth is described as something opposite to moral evils such as gluttony, fornication, drunkenness or foolish and expensive ambitions. In that context, knowledge and ability to accumulate wealth become virtues equal to thrift and moderation and even crucial characteristics by which one can earn freedom in life for oneself. At the very end of the *Oeconomicus*, Ischomachus further supports this opinion by claiming that a house master who can organise his servants to carry out agricultural production well and willingly must possess a portion of the nature of the king; and he also must be divine and is bestowed with a gift of the gods.⁴⁵⁰ Sarah Pomeroy shows her amazement at the fact that Xenophon even applies the alleged

⁴⁵⁰ Xen. *Oec.* 21.10-12. It seems that this idea is quite traditional and perhaps reflects Xenophon's memory of Socrates, who cites Homer's works frequently in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*. See also Hom. *Od.* 19.109-114 (in which Odysseus praises the ability to benefit his subjects of a great king); Hom. *Il.* 18.550-560 (which describes the scene of labour organised by a king).

aristocratic title ‘καλός τε καὶ ἀγαθός’ to hard-working slaves.⁴⁵¹ In my opinion, the use of this title for slaves is understandable in Xenophon’s context, as anyone who is competent in increasing his master’s wealth in a just way does deserve praise and must be considered as a virtuous man in Xenophon’s view.

On the other hand, Xenophon’s arguments in support of physical labour are quite cautious and have certain limits. His praise of labour and accumulation of wealth was strictly confined to the sphere of agricultural production and he carefully followed the tradition Hesiod set up centuries ago (Hes. *Op.* 312-326). Xenophon’s praise of the gathering of wealth through agricultural labour is usually mixed with or hidden behind his praise of other traditional moral qualities, such as diligence and thrift. He still criticises the so-called ‘banausic (βαναυσικά) occupations’ and believes that these labours are harmful, as they can ruin body and soul and make the workers effeminate and selfish (Xen. *Oec.* 4.2-3.). In spite of this, Xenophon’s *Poroi* still makes an innovative contribution in the development of economic thought in ancient history.

‘More sensitive to the influence of moral virtues than of social inequalities, Xenophon suggests that wealth, or at least ease with money, is first a matter of personal merit.’⁴⁵² In the *Poroi*, we see that Xenophon already breaks through the limit set by the tradition of Hesiod and begins to take the art of accumulating wealth through trade, taxation, agricultural and artisan production, discovery and exploitation of mineral resources (Xen. *Vect.* 4.11-12), proper distribution and economical use of wealth as a whole to be something positive in moral sense. The wisdom of managing financial resources well is in itself one kind of virtue. It creates justice, as Athenians no longer need to oppress their allies if they can obtain sufficient wealth from their own land (Xen. *Vect.* 1.1); it creates peace, as economic prosperity and political peace secure each other in turn (Xen. *Vect.* 5.1-4); it creates

⁴⁵¹ Pomeroy (1994), 259.

⁴⁵² Gauthier (2010), 128.

friendship, as most other city-states would be willing to become ally to a rich, just, and peaceful Athens instead of her enemies (Xen. *Vect.* 5.13). And it also offers a solid foundation for the flourishing of other positive moral qualities and the achievement of ultimate happiness, as Xenophon points out:

Well now, surely, if none of these proposals is impossible or even difficult, if by carrying them into effect we shall be regarded with more affection by the Greeks, shall live in greater security, and be more glorious; if the people will be maintained in comfort and the rich no more burdened with the expenses of war; if with a large surplus in hand we shall celebrate our festivals with even more splendour than at present, shall restore the temples, and repair the walls and docks, and shall give back to priests, councillors, magistrates, knights their ancient privileges; surely, I say, our proper course is to proceed with this scheme forthwith, that already in our generation we may come to see our city secure and prosperous. (Xen. *Vect.* 6.1)

As Xenophon says, wealth is also a guarantee of affection and glory among Greeks. It supplies Athenians with the necessary resources to show proper piety towards the gods and at sacred festivals. It can relieve the rich from suffering financial exploitation under the democracy and restore ancient privileges to priests and aristocratic politicians on a just basis. Finally, a practical and rational economic plan can lead to concord, prosperity and happiness of the whole civic body. At the end of the *Poroi*, Xenophon even asks the Athenians to send his plan to Dodona and Delphi to consult the opinions of gods (Xen. *Vect.* 6.2-3), as he believes that the enterprise to enrich the state is divine and is sure to be approved by the gods. ‘With heaven to help us in what we do, it is likely that our undertakings will go forward continually to the greater weal of the state.’ (Xen. *Vect.* 6.3) In that case, the effort to accumulate wealth for the people is a holy responsibility of political leaders and is supervised by the will of gods.

Of course, from the very beginning of the history of human civilization,

peasants, artisans, merchants, as well as military and political leaders, must already know well the practical use of the art of economic production and financial management; yet it seems that very few people tried to justify it in a moral and philosophical sense. In the ancient Greek intellectual context, especially in ethical discussions, wealth is generally taken as something negative and harmful for morality.⁴⁵³ Even in Pindar and Bacchylides' odes, where many victors praised did not take part in the competition themselves but were only rich enough to offer money, the praise of wealth is often made with some reservations.⁴⁵⁴ Herodotus' Solon claims, 'For he who is very rich is not more blessed than he who has but enough for the day, unless fortune so attend him that he ends his life well, having all good things about him. Many men of great wealth are unblessed, and many that have no great substance are fortunate. Now the very rich man who is yet unblessed has but two advantages over the fortunate man, but the fortunate man has many advantages over the rich but unblessed.'⁴⁵⁵ According to Herodotus' belief and what he narrates next, wealth is actually harmful and is very likely to cause disasters and ruins to its possessor, because the benefit it brings is trivial in comparison to wisdom, virtue and good fortune. A rich man, on the other hand, is seldom blessed, for the gods are very jealous to all kinds of 'sweetness of living' (Hdt. 7.46). Another tradition reports that the philosopher Thales once earned a large sum of money in the olive trade by making use of his astronomical knowledge, but he did so only to show to others that he had actually mastered the art of enriching himself, yet disdained to make use of it in daily life, because wealth is valueless compared to philosophy (Arist. *Pol.* 1259a5-23).

In his *Symposium*, Xenophon seems to adopt the traditional contempt for material wealth in philosophical tradition. In the discussion recorded, Antisthenes was proud of his wealth and Charmides boasted of poverty (Xen. *Symp.* 3.8-9); yet

⁴⁵³ Thgn. 227-32, 693-994 (in Gerber); Solon, 4.1-16 (in Gerber); Aesch. *Ag.* 374-380; Soph. *Ant.* 293-299; Balme (1984), 151; Kurke (1991), 182-194.

⁴⁵⁴ Cairns (2010), 68.

⁴⁵⁵ Hdt. 1.32. Similar plot and attitude can also be found in Bacchyl. 3.23-62 (in Snell).

their opinions are not contradictory to each other and together comprise to a systematic and negative opinion on wealth. Charmides claimed that poverty brings him freedom and makes him ‘a sort of tyrant’ (Xen. *Symp.* 4.29-33); and Antisthenes clarified that he did not really have much wealth, but possessed the virtues of moderation and thrift (Xen. *Symp.* 4.34-39). Therefore he became happier than those rich but greedy men, because ‘people don’t keep wealth and poverty in their houses, but in their hearts’ (Xen. *Symp.* 4.34). Antisthenes finally declared, ‘Frankly, people with an eye for thrift are much more likely to be just people than those with an eye for spending. The ones who are most content with what they have got are least excited by what belongs to others.’ (Xen. *Symp.* 4.42) And in the *Spartan Constitution*, Xenophon also praises Lycurgus because he ‘prohibited free men from having anything to do with the acquisition of wealth’ (Xen. *Lac.* 7.2). Due to the limitation of the evidence, it is not easy to re-establish the chronological order of Xenophon’s *Symposium*, *Spartan Constitution* and *Oeconomicus*, but all these writings must be earlier than the *Poroi*, and it seems that the negative attitude towards wealth in the former two works belong to Socrates or early thought of Xenophon, even though they might be composed after the *Oeconomicus* as faithful records of the real opinions of Socrates’ friends and the historical practice in ancient Sparta.

Nevertheless, there is also a typical opinion in Socratic philosophy on the relationship between use and value,⁴⁵⁶ which must have inspired Xenophon’s economic thought. One important passage of this kind is reported by Xenophon in his *Memorabilia*:

Aristippus: ‘Do you mean that the same things are both beautiful and ugly?’

Socrates: ‘Of course — and both good and bad. For what is good for hunger is often bad for fever, and what is good for fever bad for hunger; what is beautiful for running is often ugly for wrestling, and what is beautiful for wrestling ugly

⁴⁵⁶ Pomeroy (1994), 219.

for running. For all things are good when they are well adapted, bad and ugly in relation to other things when they are badly adapted.’ (Xen. *Mem.* 3.8.6-7)

A similar narrative appears in Plato’s *Greater Hippias*, in which Socrates points out beauty of wood and gold is relative and is determined by its use (Pl. *Hp. Mai.* 291b). Though Dorion argues that the meanings of these two passages are slightly different,⁴⁵⁷ they show clearly that both Xenophon and Plato are aware of a typical Socratic view that some values can be relative and measured by its practical use, though the latter sometimes expresses another view in his other Socratic dialogues in different context.⁴⁵⁸ At first glance, this doctrine seems to be irrelevant to economics. But it is noteworthy that both Plato and Xenophon develop this idea and connect relativeness of value with wisdom on proper management of wealth as a virtue. In Plato’s *Euthydemus*, after a similar discussion on value and use of material wealth (Pl. *Euthyd.* 280b-281a), Socrates concludes:

So, to sum up, Clinias, it seems likely that with respect to all the things we called good in the beginning, the correct account is not that in themselves they are good by nature, but rather as follows: if ignorance controls them, they are greater evils than their opposites, to the extent that they are more capable of complying with a bad master; but if good sense and wisdom are in control, they are greater goods. In themselves, however, neither sort is of any value. ... Since we all wish to be happy, and since we appear to become so by using things and using them rightly, and since knowledge was the source of rightness and good fortune, it seems to be necessary that every man should prepare himself by every means to become as wise as possible. (Pl. *Euthyd.* 281d-282a)

As a greater philosopher and a cleverer man than Xenophon, Plato explains and develops Socrates’ theory of the relation between value and use very clearly. Wealth without right use is useless or even harmful, and then ignorance of use of wealth

⁴⁵⁷ Bandini and Dorion (2011a), 337-338.

⁴⁵⁸ For example, in the Pl. *Phd.* 102a-103a, Plato’s Socrates argues that great things are great because of their greatness, which never becomes small in any case, which seems to be contradictory to his teaching in *the Greater Hippias* and the *Euthydemus*.

causes waste of value and is therefore a great evil. A virtuous man must be one who pays attention to obtain knowledge of whatever he possesses and put everything he possesses into proper use. This is not only a practical skill, but a moral obligation in a philosophical sense. However, as a purer philosopher than Xenophon, Plato has no interest in doing any practical research on economic affairs. After abruptly cutting short the discussion on the importance of knowledge and wisdom about the proper use of wealth, Plato's Socrates immediately turned to his central abstract topic on whether wisdom can be taught (Pl. *Euthyd.* 282c). On the contrary, after forming a positive view on agricultural labour in his *Oeconomicus*, Xenophon went on further by expanding the object of his research to revenue gained from every possible sources under ancient economic conditions, and wrote the *Poroi* in his old age, in the hope that certain elements of his evidence might be adopted by wise politicians to benefit the Athenian people and build up a new Athenian hegemony in Greek world in peace and justice. In that sense, Xenophon develops Socratic ethics in a utilitarian way.⁴⁵⁹ He evidently believed that it is his obligation to show to his people how to make use of every kind of existing resources in Athens to its maximum. He writes with patriotic passion in the opening part of the *Poroi* as follows:

The extreme mildness of the seasons here is shown by the actual products. At any rate, plants that will not even grow in many countries bear fruit here. Not less productive than the land is the sea around the coasts. Notice too that the good things which the gods send in their season all come in earlier here and go out later than elsewhere. And the pre-eminence of the land is not only in the things that bloom and wither annually: she has other good things that last for ever. Nature has put in her abundance of stone, from which are fashioned lovely temples and lovely altars, and goodly statues for the gods. Many Greeks and barbarians alike have need of it. Again, there is land that yields no fruit if sown, and yet, when quarried, feeds many times the number it could support if it grew

⁴⁵⁹ Schorn (2011), 65. For more evidence of Xenophon's pragmatic outlook, see Xen. *Mem.* 3.6.5-6; 3.6.13-14.

corn. And there is silver in the soil, the gift, beyond doubt, of divine providence: at any rate, many as are the states near to her by land and sea, into none of them does even a thin vein of silver extend.

One might reasonably suppose that the city lies at the centre of Greece, nay of the whole inhabited world. For the further we go from her, the more intense is the heat or cold we meet with; and every traveller who would cross from one to the other end of Greece passes Athens as the centre of a circle, whether he goes by water or by road. Then too, though she is not wholly sea-girt, all the winds of heaven bring to her the goods she needs and bear away her exports, as if she were an island; for she lies between two seas: and she has a vast land trade as well; for she is of the mainland. Further, on the borders of most states dwell barbarians who trouble them: but the neighbouring states of Athens are themselves remote from the barbarians. (Xen. *Vect.* 1.2-8)

According to this passage and Xenophon's argument in the *Oeconomicus* and the *Poroi* that the knowledge of proper use of economic resources is a virtue, I believe it is safe to conclude that, in Xenophon's mind, the superior environment and riches of all kinds of natural resources are gifts bestowed by the gods to Athenians, and the prosperity of Athens must be approved by divine will. At the same time, the current lamentable financial crisis and general poverty among Athenian people is caused by the inaction of its former political leaders, as the ignorance of the right use of resources and wealth to benefit people is a great crime in a society's leaders. In the context, such a positive attitude to wealth might also be taken as a hidden critique to certain economic policies carried out in contemporary Athens, as the Athenian democratic regime is described as a system oppressing rich citizens by Charmides in Xenophon's *Symposium* (Xen. *Symp.* 4.29-32). In sum, Xenophon's *Poroi* is not only advice for Athenian political leaders in dealing with the current financial and diplomatic crisis, but is also a summary of Xenophon's immature but innovative 'moral economics', which serves as a supplement of moral education carried out by

competent leadership from an economic perspective. Joseph Nicholas Jansen even believes that Xenophon already established an anti-imperialist economics in the *Poroi* by proposing economic means to relieve diplomatic crisis.⁴⁶⁰ Though Xenophon did not have time to polish and develop this moral-economic doctrine further and it seems that his plans were never adopted by Athenian democratic government, its significance in Xenophon's thought system should not be overlooked.

IV. Conclusion

In 1973, Moses Finley pointed out the limitation of the whole Greek and Roman economic thought (including Xenophon, of course) in his *The Ancient Economy*, a classic monograph which 'transformed our understanding of ancient economic structures'.⁴⁶¹ In his opinion, ancient economic doctrines are still at a very primitive stage and are very different from modern economics. 'In Xenophon, however, there is not one sentence that expresses an economic principle or offers any economic analysis, nothing on efficiency of production, "rational" choice, the marketing of crops.'⁴⁶² He also suggests that many modern economic concepts and terms have no equivalent meanings in ancient Greek or classical Latin.⁴⁶³ He also criticises that Xenophon's view on trade is narrowly confined in the sphere of local markets.⁴⁶⁴ In my opinion, although Finley's depiction of ancient economy has been challenged in later studies,⁴⁶⁵ his analysis of Xenophon's economic thought is generally correct. Xenophon's economic opinions are immature, scattered, or at least quite alien for us. The title and subject of his first work highly relevant to economic affairs, *Oikonomikós*, has 'no single precise English equivalent that would be appropriate in

⁴⁶⁰ Jansen (2007), 210.

⁴⁶¹ Scheidel, Morris and Saller (2007), 3.

⁴⁶² Finley (1999), 19.

⁴⁶³ Finley (1999), 21.

⁴⁶⁴ Finley (1999), 135.

⁴⁶⁵ Möller (2007), 368-369.

all contexts'⁴⁶⁶ and contains a lot of non-economic elements.⁴⁶⁷ And the economic plan in the *Poroi* has also been much criticised by modern economists and historians,⁴⁶⁸ though they have to admit that some suggestions in it are to the point and offer some practical solutions of financial problems of Athens in the mid-fourth century B.C.⁴⁶⁹

Nevertheless, as a supplement to his system of moral education, Xenophon's *Poroi* (as well as his *Oeconomicus*) is still noteworthy and important. It shows that Xenophon's citizens moulded by moral education carried out by competent political leaders do not live in 'virtuous poverty', but are supported by sufficient material wealth gathered by right use of natural resources and wise management of the collection and distribution of production, so that they are able to enjoy happiness in both their souls and bodies. A competent leader in Xenophon's ideal world is a brave general, a pious priest, a just judge and a learned philosopher; but at the same time he must be an expert on agriculture and the management of revenue as well, so that he can enrich his people by just means and secure lasting peace and prosperity of his state in cultural, political as well as economic sense.⁴⁷⁰ The knowledge of production and proper use of wealth is not only a practical skill, but is also an indispensable element of competent leadership and a moral virtue in itself. In this way, Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* and *Poroi* manage to enrich the content of his system of social and moral education and create one unique type of 'moral economics' in ancient Greek history of thought.

⁴⁶⁶ Pomeroy (1994), 213-214.

⁴⁶⁷ Austin and Vidal-Naquet (1977), 9.

⁴⁶⁸ Tuplin (2003), 1631.

⁴⁶⁹ Ober (2008), 252.

⁴⁷⁰ Schorn (2011), 86.

Part 3: Application of Xenophon's Theory of Social Education in His Literary Composition

In Part 2, I attempt to reconstruct Xenophon's theory of moral education by evidence scattered throughout his extant works. In Xenophon's context, moral education is social, highly political and chiefly motivated by competent leadership. The ideal educator must be able, virtuous and almost perfect in himself; and he must educate his subjects by his own examples, by wise laws, strict supervisions, generous rewards and proper organisation of public activities. In order to overcome challenges of violence and poverty, certain immoral means and measures to collect wealth are allowed in Xenophon's ethics for pursuing ultimate virtue. In comparison to Plato or Aristotle's profound thoughts, Xenophon's theory of moral education is quite simple and less abstract (though not necessarily easier to follow or more practical). Sometimes it even seems to be superficial. As a result, Xenophon never enjoys as much fame as Plato, Aristotle and Isocrates do in scholarship of Greek philosophy and education in the fourth century B.C. Nevertheless, even if we have to admit that Xenophon's theory of moral education is not quite philosophical or great in itself, its importance and influence still should not be underestimated. In antiquity, besides being a second-rate philosopher, Xenophon was also respected as a prolific writer and founding father of many literary genres, including biography, memoir and certain types of practical manuals. Xenophon's application of his educational theory in these works left profound and lasting influence on the development of western literature. In this part, I plan to analyse Xenophon's application of his moral theory in two of his minor writings, the *Agesilaus* and the *Oeconomicus*, and evaluate Xenophon's contribution to the formation of the moral tradition in Greek and Latin biography as well as the study of the private sphere in classical literature. Chapter 1 treats Xenophon's *Agesilaus* and shows that it is a work of moral exemplification based on Xenophon's theory of moral education presented in Part 2. Chapter 2 starts from a

discussion of the queen bee metaphor used by Xenophon in his *Oeconomicus* and then analyses Xenophon's effort of introducing art of moral education from the public sphere to the domestic sphere in this dialogue.

Chapter 1: Xenophon's *Agesilaus* and the Moral Tradition of Ancient Biography

Since 1950s, the authenticity of Xenophon's *Agesilaus* has been universally accepted and its date has been precisely fixed as the winter of 360/59 B.C. As Xenophon himself points out, it is, or at least intended to be, delivered at a funeral (Xen. *Ages.* 10.3) to praise his virtue and glory (Xen. *Ages.* 1.1). In other words, this work is a prose encomium in honour of the dead king and Xenophon's close friend, Agesilaus. Unlike most of Xenophon's other minor works, the *Agesilaus* received quite a lot of attention in twentieth-century scholarship, because its nature and intention are highly relevant to one hotly discussed academic topic: the birth and development of ancient biography.

One of the earliest noteworthy researchers on ancient biography, the German scholar Friedrich Leo points out that Xenophon's *Agesilaus* should be called ἔπαινος or ἐγκώμιον,⁴⁷¹ as Xenophon himself states in the work. It focuses on ἀρετή after the chronological narrative of Agesilaus' πράξις,⁴⁷² and Xenophon actually follows the tradition of prose encomium set up by Isocrates' *Evagoras*⁴⁷³ that influenced the development of biographical writing within the 'Peripatetic school' down to Plutarch. Another German classicist, Albrecht Dihle's view on Xenophon generally follows that of Friedrich Leo: Xenophon's *Agesilaus* was inspired by the genre of prose encomium invented by Isocrates,⁴⁷⁴ and therefore focused on exploring character and personality just as Isocrates had done for Evagoras.⁴⁷⁵ The similarity between the *Agesilaus* and the *Evagoras* permits Dihle to 'assume a formal crystallization of the literary genre (biography)' before the middle of the fourth century B.C.⁴⁷⁶

⁴⁷¹ Leo (1901), 90.

⁴⁷² Leo (1901), 91.

⁴⁷³ Leo (1901), 92.

⁴⁷⁴ Dihle (1956), 27.

⁴⁷⁵ Dihle (1956), 28.

⁴⁷⁶ Dihle (1994), 217.

In 1971, the Italian scholar Arnaldo Momigliano published *The Development of Greek Biography*, covering the content of his lecture at Harvard University. This classic work laid the foundation for all later academic studies on ancient biography. In his view, Isocrates' *Evagoras* and Xenophon's *Agesilaus* and *Cyropaedia* are three representative fourth-century biographies,⁴⁷⁷ and Xenophon 'especially must be regarded as a pioneer experimenter in biographical forms'.⁴⁷⁸ Xenophon took the *Evagoras* as a model for his *Agesilaus* and shared Isocrates' ideas and methods in this work.⁴⁷⁹ His *Memorabilia*⁴⁸⁰, *Cyropaedia*⁴⁸¹ and *Anabasis*⁴⁸² are also noteworthy biographies. As Joseph Geiger points out, Momigliano's definition of biography is problematic.⁴⁸³ Momigliano defines biography as 'an account of the life of a man from birth to death',⁴⁸⁴ and in his eyes, Greek and Roman myths,⁴⁸⁵ Plato's *Apology*,⁴⁸⁶ the ceremonial laments of Andromache in the *Iliad*,⁴⁸⁷ the genealogical trees of Greek aristocracy,⁴⁸⁸ legends of heroes,⁴⁸⁹ and even Demosthenes' *De Corona*⁴⁹⁰ and Plato's *Letter 7*⁴⁹¹ are all biographies. In my opinion, his definition of biography is too broad and inaccurate to distinguish biography as a literary genre from other descriptive works which contain certain materials relevant to a person's life. Although many of Xenophon's works talk about heroes' deeds and words, his *Agesilaus* is the only prose encomium which sets up an example for later biographical works and deserves special attention in the history of Greek literature.

Instead of discussing broad trends in the development of ancient biography, D.A. Russell limits his study to Plutarch but still reaches similar conclusions to those of

⁴⁷⁷ Momigliano (1971), 8.

⁴⁷⁸ Momigliano (1971), 47.

⁴⁷⁹ Momigliano (1971), 50.

⁴⁸⁰ Momigliano (1971), 52.

⁴⁸¹ Momigliano (1971), 55.

⁴⁸² Momigliano (1971), 57.

⁴⁸³ Geiger (1985), 14-15.

⁴⁸⁴ Momigliano (1971), 11.

⁴⁸⁵ Momigliano (1971), 11-12.

⁴⁸⁶ Momigliano (1971), 17.

⁴⁸⁷ Momigliano (1971), 24.

⁴⁸⁸ Momigliano (1971), 24.

⁴⁸⁹ Momigliano (1971), 24-25.

⁴⁹⁰ Momigliano (1971), 48.

⁴⁹¹ Momigliano (1971), 62.

Leo and Momigliano. He believes that in the ancient context βίος actually means ‘way of life’;⁴⁹² biographies write about childhood anecdotes, education, responses to the challenge of circumstances in order to answer the question ‘what sort of man was he?’⁴⁹³ According to his theory, Xenophon’s *Agesilaus* was produced by recasting historical material (very likely from his *Hellenica*) in the rhetorical mould of the encomium and aimed at moral evaluation.⁴⁹⁴ Afterwards this tradition was firmly established by Isocrates’ students⁴⁹⁵ Ephorus and Theopompus⁴⁹⁶ and left for Plutarch to adopt.

In sum, though previous scholars start their researches on ancient biography from different perspectives, their evaluations of Xenophon’s *Agesilaus* are very similar: Xenophon’s *Agesilaus* is a work different from his historical *Hellenica* in nature, because it follows an established tradition of prose encomium and focuses on the observation of personality and character (that is to say moral issues); its direct model is Isocrates’ *Evagoras*.⁴⁹⁷ However, in my opinion, this kind of evaluation actually ignores Xenophon’s originality and fails to realise how his theory of moral education influences his composition of the *Agesilaus*. As set forth in former chapters, though Xenophon is not a philosopher as great as Plato or Aristotle, he does have an original, systematic theory of moral education. And this theory leaves its mark in his *Agesilaus*, though it is not a work directly on moral education. Therefore, if we want to understand Xenophon’s *Agesilaus*, we must take consideration of Xenophon’s own ideas on moral education, which dominate his literary composition and make it distinct from the works of contemporary authors. And its relationship to the *Evagoras* and the *Hellenica* should also be re-examined.

⁴⁹² Russell (1973), 101-102.

⁴⁹³ Russell (1973), 102-103.

⁴⁹⁴ Russell (1973), 104.

⁴⁹⁵ The statement of the *Suda* that Theopompus is a student of Isocrates is still of disputation. See Hau (2007), 73.

⁴⁹⁶ Russell (1973), 104.

⁴⁹⁷ Cox (1983), 8; Hägg and Rousseau (2002), 3; Pownall (2004), 33.

I. Moral Elements in Histories and Encomia

In my view, both history and encomium may or may not concern moral issues in theory. Historians pay attention to memorable things in human society, and writers of encomium look for praiseworthy subjects for their heroes. Neither genre has a direct logical connection with moral topics. In modern life, few people would claim that a biography in favour of its hero is not history. Of course, history and prose encomium/biography belonged to different genres in the Greek and Roman cultural context (it is noteworthy that such a distinction also does not exist in ancient Chinese, Hebrew and Arabic historiography either⁴⁹⁸); but that connection in Greek and Roman literature was the product of ancient literary practice and must have been made later than the birth of history and prose encomium, and did not exist at all at the very beginning.

In the case of history, it is quite easy to show that most Greek historians show no reluctance to involve moral subjects in their works, and moral exemplification remains one of the favourite elements in ancient historiography ever since the time of Herodotus.⁴⁹⁹ In recent studies, Rosaria Vignolo Munson thoroughly studies Herodotus' use of ἀνάγκη in his work and confirms that it is highly moralistic.⁵⁰⁰ Christopher Pelling and Lisa Hau suggest that the conversation between Solon and Croesus in Herodotus' Book I serves as one important opening analogy to lead his audience to his moral lessons⁵⁰¹ and to present the changeability of fortune in a moralised way.⁵⁰² In my opinion, the tendency of moralisation in Herodotus is already quite evident. In the opening passage of his work, Herodotus claims:

What Herodotus of Halicarnassus has learnt by inquiry is set forth here: in order that the memory of the past may not be blotted out from among men by time,

⁴⁹⁸ For instance, all the 24 official histories in ancient China take the form of collection of biographies; and a lot of 'historical narrative' in the Old Testament and Koran takes a certain hero as the key figure.

⁴⁹⁹ Pownall (2004), 5-6.

⁵⁰⁰ Munson (2001), 30, 49.

⁵⁰¹ Pelling (2006), 173; Hau (2007), 88-90.

⁵⁰² Hau (2007), 145.

and that great and marvelous deeds (ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θώματα) done by Greeks and foreigners and especially the reason why they warred against each other may not lack renown. (Hdt. 1.1)

According to Herodotus' statement, in the fifth century B.C., the task of history is simple and explicit: it should record great and marvellous deeds. These great deeds do not have to be moral; but in Herodotus' own works moral subjects are very popular, as they can make readers learn lessons from them as well as attract their interests. As the founding father of history, Herodotus shows us clearly in his own work that though moral exemplification is not the essence of historical writings, it is not incompatible with the genre of history and plays an active role in the development of historiography since its birth. In any case, as a follower of Herodotus' tradition (Dion. Hal. *Pomp.* 4; *De imit.* 2.1-6), Xenophon has no cause to suppose that he can only make use of moral exemplification in his prose encomium *Agesilaus*, but he should not do the same things in his *Hellenica*. On the contrary, H. Homeyer believes that Herodotus' history contains a lot of biographical elements;⁵⁰³ and Paul Cartledge points out that Xenophon's moralising contrast between the pomp and finery of the Persian viceroy and the unostentatious simplicity of Agesilaus and his thirty Spartiate advisers in the *Agesilaus* imitates Herodotus' moral comparison of Pausanias and Mardonius in the *Histories*.⁵⁰⁴ So the involvement of moral issues is by no means the privilege of biography only. In ancient Greek literature, moral topics exist in both historical works and biographies; and we can frequently see the interaction of the two genres.

And how is the case of encomium? According to N.J. Lowe, ἐγκώμιον used to be a regular term to name a poetic genre including Pindar and Bacchylides' victory odes, which was later used more widely to mean any literary work of eulogy, both verse and prose, from the fourth century B.C. on since the composition of Plato's

⁵⁰³ Momigliano (1971), 12.

⁵⁰⁴ Cartledge (1987), 192-193.

Symposium.⁵⁰⁵ In H.G. Liddell and R. Scott's *Greek-English Lexicon*, ἐγκώμιον simply means 'laudatory ode' or 'eulogy, panegyric'.⁵⁰⁶ And even if we suppose that this 'genre' has to focus on ἀρετή in practice, we still have to be cautious that the content of ἀρετή in general ancient Greek context must be much broader than 'virtue' or 'morality' in English and ἀρετή discussed as an ethical term in works written by Plato or Aristotle. In fact, judging from Pindar and Bacchylides' ἐπινίκιον, the name of which comes from Alexandrian tradition but was taken as poetic encomium in classical cultural context,⁵⁰⁷ bliss from the gods (Pind. *Ol.* 6.77-78; *Pyth.* 1.41-42; Bacchyl. 4.1-10; 5.50-55 (in Snell)), noble birth (Pind. *Ol.* 17-23; *Pyth.* 1.43-57; *Pyth.* 7.1-22; *Pyth.* 8.10-16; *Nem.* 2.16-24), good fortune (Pindar, *Ol.* 8.74-76; Bacchyl. 1.162-184; 5.176-200 (in Snell)), huge wealth (Pindar, *Pyth.* 5.1-4; Bacchyl. 3.57-98 (in Snell)) and admirable physical strength (Pindar, *Nem.* 1.25-30; Bacchyl. 9.21-46 (in Snell)) are more common topics than morality in the ethical sense. Of course, moral virtues are also considered praiseworthy, but it does not mean that encomium's subject must be fixed to morality.

Therefore, logically, there is no reason for us to suppose that the noteworthy moral elements in Xenophon's *Agesilaus* can be satisfactorily explained by 'natural differences' between history and encomium. Of course, as encomium is by nature more rhetorical than history due to the former's poetic origin, the same moral subjects moderately praised in historical works may be exaggerated in an encomium. But, as we shall see below, even this difference is not quite clear in actual literary composition and should not be overestimated.

II. Isocrates' *Evagoras* and Xenophon's *Agesilaus*

⁵⁰⁵ Pl. *Symp.* 177a; Lowe (2007), 167-168.

⁵⁰⁶ Liddell and Scott (1996), 475.

⁵⁰⁷ Aristophanes, *Fry-Cooks*, fr. 505 (in Henderson); Pl. *Leg.* 822b; Lowe (2007), 167, 176. Simon Hornblower suggests that the birth of epinikian poetry may be colonial in origin (Hornblower (2004b), 26). But in the concept of Isocrates and Xenophon, Pindar and Bacchylides' epinikian poems must be standard encomia in verse.

As set forth, what Xenophon took as his example seems to be Isocrates' *Evagoras*, which had been finished just five years before and served as the first model of prose funeral encomium written for a politician ever known to the Greek world and Xenophon himself.⁵⁰⁸ Obviously, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* imitates the *Evagoras*' writing skills, chronological order, ethical classification and certain items of vocabulary. But the two works also show different attitudes and understandings of morality, and the focus on morality is just one of the most important elements which shaped Plutarch, Suetonius and other great ancient biographers in Hellenistic and Roman age.

Quite a few scholars notice that Xenophon was not a blind follower of Isocrates in biographical composition. Momigliano points out that Xenophon was much more interested in his hero's actual achievements; and he also had greater historical sense and experience than Isocrates.⁵⁰⁹ Dihle also comments that as Xenophon's relation to Agesilaus was closer than that between Isocrates and Evagoras, the former's description was more vivid and impressive.⁵¹⁰ Nevertheless, few researchers emphasise the two authors' different attitudes to moral issues, though the difference is of much importance for explaining the historical development of moral exemplification in ancient biography.

First of all, Isocrates' *Evagoras* touches upon quite a lot of subjects beyond moral issues, while Xenophon's *Agesilaus* focuses on presenting the moral merit of its hero. For clarifying the purpose of the encomium, Isocrates explains in the opening passage:

Ὅρων, ὦ Νικόκλεις, τιμῶντά σε τὸν τάφον τοῦ πατρὸς οὐ μόνον τῷ πλήθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει τῶν ἐπιφερομένων, ἀλλὰ καὶ χοροῖς καὶ μουσικῇ καὶ γυμνικοῖς

⁵⁰⁸ In later scholarship, Gorgias' *Helen*, Isocrates' *Helen* and *Busiris* are sometimes also called prose encomium. However, these 'show piece' talk about mythological figures and are composed mainly for rhetorical practice. Their contents are quite similar to Plato's *Apology* and Lysias' lawsuit orations and seem to be used for rhetorical exercises, but have little in common with Isocrates' *Evagoras* and Xenophon's *Agesilaus*. Further discussion can be found in Duffy (1983), 83-90 and Lauxtermann (1998), 525-537.

⁵⁰⁹ Momigliano (1971), 50.

⁵¹⁰ Dihle (1956), 28.

ἀγῶσιν, ἔτι δὲ πρὸς τούτοις ἵππων τε καὶ τριήρων ἀμίλλαις, καὶ λείποντ' οὐδεμίαν τῶν τοιούτων ὑπερβολήν, ἡγησάμην Εὐαγόραν, εἴ τις ἐστὶν αἴσθησις τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι περὶ τῶν ἐνθάδε γιγνομένων, εὐμενῶς μὲν ἀποδέχεσθαι καὶ ταῦτα, καὶ χαίρειν ὀρῶντα τήν τε περὶ αὐτὸν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ τὴν σὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν, πολὺ δ' ἂν ἔτι πλείω χάριν ἔχειν ἢ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν, εἴ τις δυνηθείη περὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν κινδύνων ἀξίως διελθεῖν τῶν ἐκεῖν' πεπραγμένων· εὐρήσομεν γὰρ τοὺς φιλοτίμους καὶ μεγαλοψύχους τῶν ἀνδρῶν οὐ μόνον ἀντὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἐπαινέσθαι βουλομένους, ἀλλ' ἀντὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἀποθνήσκειν εὐκλεῶς αἰρουμένους, καὶ μᾶλλον περὶ τῆς δόξης ἢ τοῦ βίου σπουδάζοντα, καὶ πάντα ποιοῦντα, ὅπως ἀθάνατον τὴν περὶ αὐτῶν μνήμην καταλείψουσιν.

When I saw you, Nicocles, honouring the tomb of your father, not only with numerous and beautiful offerings, but also with dances, music, and athletic contests, and furthermore, with races of horses and triremes, and leaving to others no possibility of surpassing you in such celebrations, I judged that Evagoras (if the dead have any perception of that which takes place in this world), while gladly accepting these offerings and rejoicing in the spectacle of your devotion and princely magnificence in honouring him, would feel far greater gratitude to anyone who could worthily recount his principles in life and his perilous deeds than to all other men; for we shall find that men of ambition and greatness of soul not only are desirous of praise for such things, but prefer a glorious death to life, zealously seeking glory rather than existence, and doing all that lies in their power to leave behind a memory of themselves that shall never die. (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 1-3)

In other words, the main purpose of Isocrates' *Evagoras* is to show his glory (δόξα), and ensure people's lasting memory (μνήμη) for him, so that his ἀρεταί would never 'be forgotten among all mankind' (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 4). In my view, Isocrates faithfully follows the traditional topics of poetic encomium, which are

frequently used by Pindar,⁵¹¹ Bacchylides, and other Greek lyric poets.⁵¹² As set forth, some of these topics do contain moral sense, but quite a lot of them go beyond morality and discuss other kinds of ἀρεταί. The poets can freely praise their heroes' noble birth, good fortune and admirable wealth; these subjects are equally and sometimes even more popular than morality. And those contents are just what we see in the following passages of Isocrates' *Evagoras*.

The first thing Isocrates praises in *Evagoras* is his good birth and noble ancestry. From section 12 to section 21, Isocrates uses a quite long, sometimes tedious narrative to show how *Evagoras* is 'not inferior to the noblest and greatest examples of excellence which were of his inheritance', though many of the present audience 'are already familiar with the facts' (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 12). It is hard to imagine that anyone who took part in the king's funeral rites would be ignorant of his birth; therefore Isocrates' introduction is obviously made for rhetorical effect. The review of *Evagoras*' family history is not necessary in itself, but it is one of the most praiseworthy subjects for Isocrates and one crucial element in the audience's expectation for an encomium. After giving narrative to *Evagoras*' ancestry, Isocrates goes on to tell his audience that as a boy *Evagoras* 'possessed beauty, bodily strength, and modesty, the very qualities that are most becoming to that age' (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 22). The first two characters also have nothing to do with morality in an ethical sense. Further, Isocrates reports that *Evagoras* enjoys bliss by reason of the favour bestowed by the gods, so that he can gain his throne in spite of others' intrigues against him (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 25-26). Still this point is something praiseworthy but irrelevant to morality. In the next part, Isocrates' statement would sound quite striking to an audience waiting for moral teachings from the orator, as he claims:

Ἦγοῦμαι μὲν οὖν, εἰ καὶ μηδενὸς ἄλλου μνησθεῖην, ἀλλ' ἐνταῦθα καταλίπομι
τὸν λόγον, ῥάδιον ἐκ τούτων εἶναι γινῶναι τὴν τ' ἀρετὴν τὴν Εὐαγόρου καὶ τὸ

⁵¹¹ Pownall (2004), 32.

⁵¹² What is more, this tradition is already formed in Homer and has some influence on other prose writers, for instance Herodotus.

μέγεθος τῶν πεπραγμένων · οὐ μὴν ἀλλ’ ἔτι γε σαφέστερον περὶ ἀμφοτέρων
τούτων ἐκ τῶν ἐχομένων οἶμαι δηλώσειν.

I think that even if I should mention nothing more, but should discontinue my
discourse at this point, from what I have said the valour of Evagoras and the
greatness of his deeds would be readily manifest: nevertheless, I consider that
both will be yet more clearly revealed from what remains to be said. (Isoc.
Evagoras, 33)

Isocrates proclaims here that his task has already been done, which is to show
‘the valour of Evagoras and the greatness of his deeds’, though up to now this
encomium still has little to do with moral issues. Of course, Isocrates’ statement
seems to be rhetorical, and in his mind he may not consider what is to be said next to
be trivial or unnecessary. Nevertheless, Isocrates’ proclamation proves that
discussion on morality is not an indispensable part of Isocrates’ prose encomium.
The final aim of this work is to glorify Evagoras and preserve memory of him, and
any helpful materials can be included here. In the next half of the encomium, many
moral themes similar to those of Xenophon’s *Agesilaus* appear, yet still they go side
by side with other types of ἀρεταί. Isocrates praises Evagoras’ achievement as
surpassing that of Cyrus, as the greater part of his deeds are accomplished through
strength of his own mind and body (διὰ τῆς ψυχῆς τῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ τοῦ σῶματος) (Isoc.
Evagoras, 37). Here moral quality and body strength are equally emphasised. And in
the final sections of the whole speech, Isocrates summarises as follows:

Therefore, I believe that, if any men of the past have by their merit become
immortal, Evagoras also has earned this preferment; and my evidence for that
belief is this — that the life he lived on earth has been more blessed by fortune
and more favoured by the gods than theirs. For of the demigods the greater
number and the most renowned were, we shall find, afflicted by the most
grievous misfortunes, but Evagoras continued from the beginning to be not only
the most admired, but also the most envied for his blessings. For in what respect

did he lack utter felicity? Such ancestors Fortune gave to him as to no other man, unless it has been one sprung from the same stock, and so greatly in body and mind did he excel others that he was worthy of Asia also; and having acquired most gloriously his kingdom he continued in its possession all his life; and though a mortal by birth, he left behind a memory of himself that is immortal, and he lived just so long that he was neither unacquainted with old age, nor afflicted with the infirmities attendant upon that time of life. In addition to these blessings, that which seems to be the rarest and most difficult thing to win — to be blessed with many children who are at the same time good — not even this was denied him, but this also fell to his lot. And the greatest blessing was this: of his offspring he left no one who was addressed merely by a private title; on the contrary, one was called king, others princes, and others princesses. In view of these facts, if any of the poets have used extravagant expressions in characterizing any man of the past, asserting that he was a god among men, or a mortal divinity, all praise of that kind would be especially in harmony with the noble qualities of Evagoras (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 70-72).

The citation is quite long, but it is of great importance for us to see what the key points of the whole encomium are. The aim of the *Evagoras* is to praise its hero's happiness and glory. His happiness is first of all due to his good birth and noble ancestry; of course his morality does play a positive role in his life, but his bodily strength is equally important. What is more, the most important element to be praised is his good fortune, in Greek his εὐτυχία. The blessing of gods determines that he can safely preserve his throne, and enjoy his life without suffering from a miserable old age, and have good children who can safely inherit his power and prestige. The last sentence further reveals the connection between Isocrates' prose encomium and ancient poets' odes. Actually their natures are almost identical. What Isocrates did was to borrow writing skills and subjects from poetic encomia and adapted them into prose. For example, famous ancestries are sometimes introduced in Pindar's odes

(Pind. *Pyth.* 11.1-37; *Nem.* 6.27-46); and unusual favour of gods is the main subject of one ode of Bacchylides written for Hiero (Bacchylides, 5.50-200 (in Snell)). It is possible that Isocrates borrowed these themes from lyric poets directly or indirectly. Moral elements do exist in this work but they are neither the only subjects nor the most important parts, and Isocrates never intended to compose a prose encomium focusing on moral virtues only. Finally, Isocrates cannot expect that public readers may be educated and follow the example of Evagoras, as key elements of his ἀρεταί, for example his good birth, beauty, good fortune and flourishing offspring cannot be achieved by any kind of moral education at all.

The case in Xenophon's *Agesilaus* is rather different. Its opening part shows certain signs of imitation of Isocrates' example, and also declares the aim of writing 'an appreciation of Agesilaus that shall be worthy of his virtue and glory (ἀρετή τε καὶ δόξα)',⁵¹³ but in the encomium as a whole, Xenophon strictly confines his topics to morality and consciously covers his chronological narrative with moral colour. For example, Xenophon narrates the competition between Agesilaus and Leotychidas for the throne, but emphasises that 'the state decided in favour of Agesilaus, judging him to be the more eligible in point of birth and character (ἡ γενεά καὶ ἡ ἀρετή) alike. Surely to have been pronounced worthy of the highest state is proof sufficient of his virtue, at least before he began to reign' (Xen. *Ages.* 1.5). This comment obviously excludes good birth (γενεά) from virtue (ἀρετή) in an ethical sense, and disguises the brutal struggle in political life with a moral cover. Like Isocrates, Xenophon offers a chronological narrative of his hero's deeds. But he denies that he is following any literary tradition; he does it only because he believes 'his deeds will throw the clearest light on his qualities (τρόποι)' (Xen. *Ages.* 1.6). Another typical passage reflecting Xenophon's moral tendency is the description of Agesilaus' attitude to games:

⁵¹³ Xen. *Ages.* 1.1. Judging from what Xenophon narrates next, ἀρετή used here generally focuses on its moral sense in Socratic philosophy.

ἐκεῖνό γε μὴν πῶς οὐ καλὸν καὶ μεγαλογνώμον, τὸ αὐτὸν μὲν ἀνδρὸς ἔργοις καὶ κτήμασι κοσμεῖν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ οἶκον, κύνας τε πολλοὺς θηρευτὰς καὶ ἵππους πολεμιστηρίους τρέφοντα, Κυνίσκαν δὲ ἀδελφὴν οὕσαν πείσαι ἀρματοτροφεῖν καὶ ἐπιδεῖξαι νικώσης αὐτῆς ὅτι τὸ θρέμμα τοῦτο οὐκ ἀνδραγαθίας ἀλλὰ πλούτου ἐπίδειγμά ἐστι; τόδε γε μὴν πῶς οὐ σαφῶς πρὸς τὸ γενναῖον ἔγνω, ὅτι ἄρματι μὲν νικήσας τοὺς ιδιώτας οὐδὲν ὀνομαστότερος ἂν [εἴη] γένοιτο, εἰ δὲ φίλην μὲν πάντων μάλιστα τὴν πόλιν ἔχοι, πλείστους δὲ φίλους καὶ ἀρίστους ἀνὰ πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν κεκτῆτο, νικῶν δὲ τὴν μὲν πατρίδα καὶ τοὺς ἐταίρους εὐεργετῶν, τοὺς δὲ ἀντιπάλους τιμωρούμενος, ὅτι οὕτως ἂν εἴη νικηφόρος τῶν καλλίστων καὶ μεγαλοπρεπεστάτων ἀγωνισμάτων καὶ ὀνομαστότατος καὶ ζῶν καὶ τελευτήσας γένοιτ' ἄν;

Surely, too, he did what was good and dignified when he adorned his own estate with works and possessions worthy of a man, keeping many hounds and war horses, but persuaded his sister Cynisca to breed chariot horses, and showed by her victory that such a stud marks the owner as a person of wealth, but not necessarily of merit. How clearly his true nobility comes out in his opinion that a victory in the chariot race over private citizens would add not a whit to his renown; but if he held the first place in the affection of the people, gained the most friends and best all over the world, outstripped all others in serving his fatherland and his comrades and in punishing his adversaries, then he would be victor in the noblest and most splendid contests, and would gain high renown both in life and after death. (Xen. *Ages.* 9.6-7)

In Paul Cartledge's view, here Xenophon disguises the real political intention of Agesilaus, whose conscious abstention from public games has nothing to do with moral considerations at all.⁵¹⁴ However, large quantities of such instances reveal a basic fact that Xenophon and Isocrates show different attitudes to moral issues in their encomia. For Isocrates, moral qualities presented in the second half of his

⁵¹⁴ Cartledge (1987), 150.

encomium are only some ‘finishing touches’ to glorify his hero, whose greatness has already been marked clearly by his ancestry, good fortune and bodily strength. In Xenophon’s work, the need of offering an ideal example in moral sense serves as a guideline for the whole work and decides what materials to choose, how to explain their moral value, and how to adapt them for his purpose and even occasionally distort historical truth if necessary. In short, what Isocrates wrote was an encomium in prose adapted from poetic tradition, as he explains himself in the *Evagoras* (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 8-11); while Xenophon’s *Agesilaus* was a new type of prose encomium focusing on moral issues and was guided by his theory of moral education carried out by good leaders — this time no longer by their own discourses and policies, but by a writer’s memory and presentation of their greatest moral deeds.

In the second place, the supposed audience of moral teachings in the two prose encomia are different. Both works offer examples for moral education, but Isocrates’ moral examples are used for private philosophical education, while Xenophon’s work shows a strong intention for social education.

The very first sentence of the *Evagoras* reveals one of its most important supposed audiences (ὧ Νικόκλεις) (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 1). At the end of the work, when Isocrates tries to explain why his prose encomium is more valuable than statues, he claims:

While no one can make the bodily nature resemble moulded statues and portraits in painting, yet for those who do not choose to be slothful, but desire to be good men, it is easy to imitate the character of their fellow — men and their thoughts, and purposes — those, I mean, that are embodied in the spoken word. (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 74-75)

Up to now Isocrates’ words are still quite similar to what Xenophon says in the *Agesilaus*. But Isocrates immediately goes on to say:

I believe that for you, for your children, and for all the other descendants of Evagoras, it would be by far the best incentive, if someone should assemble his

achievements, give them verbal adornment, and submit them to you for your contemplation and study. For we exhort young men to the study of philosophy by praising others in order that they, emulating those who are eulogized, may desire to adopt the same pursuits, but I appeal to you and yours, using as examples not aliens, but members of your own family, and I counsel you to devote your attention to this, that you may not be surpassed in either word or deed by any of the Hellenes. (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 76-77)

In the following passages, Isocrates gives further moral admonitions to Evagoras' children (Isoc. *Evagoras*, 78-81). This statement tells us moral teaching in Isocrates' *Evagoras* is not only secondary, but also limited. In other words, at least in his context, Isocrates' moral education by examples was intended for Nicocles and other children of Evagoras, who are likely to be his students in philosophy or rhetoric. Whether this work is helpful to the public is none of his concern. In this aspect Xenophon's *Agésilas* is also different. In the middle of the speech, Xenophon declares, 'if I speak this falsely against the knowledge of the Greek world, I am in no way praising my hero; but I am censuring myself.' (Xen. *Agés.* 5.7) This means that Xenophon's work was (or was supposed to be) delivered before a general public.⁵¹⁵ And at the end of the speech he insists on repeating all the virtues of his hero, so that 'the praise of it may be more easily remembered' (Xen. *Agés.* 11.1). In my opinion, these remarks prove that Xenophon expected that his work would be read and accepted by the general public, and he hoped that his audiences or readers may be educated by his moral examples; while in the *Evagoras* of Isocrates, many chief characters presented, such as good birth, good fortune and favour of gods, belong to the dead king and his offspring only and cannot be learned or imitated by a general

⁵¹⁵ In my opinion, generally speaking, the corpus of Xenophon is supposed to be read by Greek elites, who have good knowledge and understanding of Greek culture, though they do not need to be expert in philosophy as Plato and Aristotle are. The *Agésilas* is particular in this aspect. It is quite obvious that its potential readers or audiences are simply common Greeks, who can appreciate the straightforward narrative and some popular ideology, for example the pan-Hellenism, presented by Xenophon in this work. Nevertheless, due to lack of external evidence, the question whether it is actually delivered at Agésilas' funeral or it is composed as a piece of rhetorical exercise will remain open and cannot be solved once for all.

public. Like the mode of moral education presented in the *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon's moral education through the glorious image of Agesilaus is also social and universal. As the following praise clearly indicates:

εἰ δὲ καλὸν εὖρημα ἀνθρώποις στάθμη καὶ κανὼν πρὸς τὸ ὀρθὰ ἐργάζεσθαι, καλὸν ἂν μοι δοκεῖ [εἶναι] ἡ Ἀγησιλάου ἀρετὴ παράδειγμα γενέσθαι τοῖς ἀνδραγαθίαν ἀσκεῖν βουλομένοις. τίς γὰρ ἂν ἢ θεοσεβῆ μιμούμενος ἀνόσιος γένοιτο ἢ δίκαιον ἄδικος ἢ σώφρονα ὕβριστής ἢ ἐγκρατὴ ἀκρατής; καὶ γὰρ δὴ οὐχ οὕτως ἐπὶ τῷ ἄλλων βασιλεύειν ὥς ἐπὶ τῷ ἑαυτοῦ ἄρχειν ἐμεγαλύνετο, οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῷ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τῷ πρὸς πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ἡγεῖσθαι τοῖς πολίταις.

If line and rule are a noble discovery of man as aids to the production of good work, I think that the virtue of Agesilaus may well stand as a noble example for those to follow who wish to make moral goodness a habit. For who that imitates a pious, a just, a sober, a self-controlled man, can come to be unrighteous, unjust, violent, wanton? In point of fact, Agesilaus prided himself less on reigning over others than on ruling himself, less on leading the people against their enemies than on guiding them to all virtue. (Xen. *Ages.* 10.2)

Xenophon's description here is quite impressive. In his life, Agesilaus endeavoured to guide his people to all virtue; after his death, his glorious deeds can still stand as a noble example, a textbook of virtue through Xenophon's encomium. Unlike Isocrates who neglects public affairs in his old age (Paus. 1.18.8) and focuses on teaching his own students philosophy and rhetoric, Xenophon shows his care for social morality in many of his writings. In his *Cyropaedia*, Cyrus the Great managed to nourish all kinds of moral virtues among his subjects by his charisma, but social order and praiseworthy Persian customs became corrupted soon after his death (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.1-26); in his *Spartan Constitution*, Lycurgus made good laws by his wisdom for Spartans to follow, while these rules are no longer respected in Xenophon's age (Xen. *Lac.* 14.1-6). In Xenophon's mind, Agesilaus is exactly another hero like Cyrus

the Great and Lycurgus living in his own age; and as a writer (or orator), he has the responsibility to record Agesilaus' great deeds as a moral example and make his positive influence everlasting through his prose encomium. Therefore, there is no wonder that Xenophon would adapt and develop Isocrates' example, and transform his prose encomium into a work presenting a noble moral example of his hero to the public. As Duane Reed Stuart correctly points out, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* is not just a clumsy imitation of Isocrates' *Evagoras*.⁵¹⁶ His original and creative contribution to the formation of moral tradition of ancient biography must be admitted and appreciated.

III. Similarity between Xenophon's *Agesilaus* and *Hellenica*

In the study of historiography, scholars often compare Xenophon's *Agesilaus* with his historical work, the *Hellenica*, in order to prove that the former's moral tendency comes from certain requirement of 'biographical tradition'. In my opinion, such conclusions are quite subjective and betray a certain teleological purpose. The differences between these two works are usually exaggerated; and their attitudes to moral issues are actually not quite different.

The existence of differences between Xenophon's *Agesilaus* and the part of his *Hellenica* that deals with Agesilaus is undeniable. To put it briefly, the *Agesilaus* is by nature more rhetorical, and therefore omits some negative and neutral historical information of its hero. In the *Agesilaus* Xenophon claims: 'Actions like these need no proofs; the mention of them is enough and they command belief immediately.' (Xen. *Ages.* 3.1) Such rhetorical expressions and contempt for historical evidence are of course unsuitable for the *Hellenica*. In the *Hellenica*, Xenophon uses long passages to narrate the struggle between Agesilaus and Lysander for power (Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.7-9), while he keeps silence about that in the *Agesilaus* as it is not

⁵¹⁶ Stuart (1928), 80-81.

praiseworthy and is unsuitable for a funeral encomium. He also refrains from talking about Sparta's foreign policies after 386 B.C., which he discusses in the *Hellenica*,⁵¹⁷ as these policies were notorious⁵¹⁸ and might not be pleasant to the ears of Spartans present at Agesilaus' funeral. Sometimes Xenophon even distorts historical truths on purpose in his prose encomium.⁵¹⁹ However, in other cases, the difference between Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Agesilaus* is vague and hard to recognise.⁵²⁰

In discussing the chronological order of Xenophon's works, the Italian scholar on classical historiography Gaetano de Sanctis, puts forth a hypothesis as follows:

Per la lingua e lo stile poi non c'è dubbio che in generale il testo a noi pervenuto delle *Hell.* è, nei passi paralleli, posteriore a quello a noi pervenuto dell' *Ag.* e lo corregge secondo certi criteri che si sono venuti imponendo a Senofonte verso il termine della sua vita di scrittore.⁵²¹

In de Sanctis' view, the only reasonable way to explain satisfactorily the sequence of composition is to assume that there existed two versions of the *Hellenica*. Then the *Agesilaus* was produced from the materials of the earlier version and it was in turn used by Xenophon to work on the later version of the *Hellenica*, which we have today. The problem of chronological sequence itself is extremely complex⁵²² and has little to do with our topic here; but this complicated hypothesis shows that the contents of Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Agesilaus* are very close and their differences in detail cannot be easily explained by distinction of literary genres. As W.P. Henry points out, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* is strikingly similar to his *Hellenica*⁵²³ and the disparities that occur are often slight.⁵²⁴ A lot of materials of the *Hellenica* also appear in the *Agesilaus*,⁵²⁵ and similar compositional methods are equally

⁵¹⁷ Cartledge (1987), 242.

⁵¹⁸ Cartledge (1987), 243.

⁵¹⁹ Momigliano (1971), 102.

⁵²⁰ Hau (2007), 210.

⁵²¹ De Sanctis (1951), 141.

⁵²² De Sanctis (1951), 127.

⁵²³ Henry (1967), 108.

⁵²⁴ Henry (1967), 108-109.

⁵²⁵ Lesky (1966), 626.

adopted in both works. Generally, the *Hellenica* offers more detailed descriptions of battles (Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.11-15; 3.4.20-24), but sometimes the *Agésilas* does the same thing (Xen. *Ages.* 2.9-11). The *Agésilas* occasionally appears to be less ‘historical’ than the *Hellenica*, but the latter is also frequently criticised for its ‘highly subjective nature’⁵²⁶ and striking omissions.⁵²⁷ Their similarities are particularly obvious in their attitudes towards moral topics.⁵²⁸ Both narrate the story of how pious Agesilaus defeated Tissaphernes, who broke his oath (Xen. *Ages.* 1.10-12; Xen. *Hell.* 3.4.5-6). And in many cases the *Hellenica* presents moral subjects beyond the *Agésilas*. It contrasts the luxury of Pharnabazus and the simplicity of Agesilaus (Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.30). It praises Agesilaus who takes care of offspring of his enemy (Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.39-40). It records the anecdote of a marriage arranged by Agesilaus to show he is good at benefiting his friends (Xen. *Hell.* 4.1.3-15). It comments Agesilaus’ piety as he refrained himself from breaking into temple of Athena to take revenge on enemies (Xen. *Hell.* 4.3.20). It also depicts Agesilaus’ kindness by describing his sadness after Agesipolis’ death (Xen. *Hell.* 5.3.20). In sum, it is evident that both Xenophon’s *Hellenica* and *Agésilas* make use of moral exemplification, though their ways of narrative and expression slightly differ. Therefore, the preference to moral issues of biography claimed by some scholars is not quite clear in Xenophon’s two works recording Agesilaus’ deeds.

What is more, the emphasis on morality and observation of personality of historical figures are also characteristic in other writings of Xenophon. Albrecht Dihle points out that both the *Agésilas* and the *Anabasis* focus on the personality of historical figures.⁵²⁹ G.J.D. Aalders believes the tendency to moralise is common feature of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*, *Agésilas* and his *Hiero*.⁵³⁰ In that case, I would rather call the moral tendency in the *Agésilas* ‘Xenophontic’ than ‘biographical’. It

⁵²⁶ Henry (1967), 204.

⁵²⁷ Riedinger (1991), 41.

⁵²⁸ Pownall (2004), 82-83.

⁵²⁹ Dihle (1956), 34.

⁵³⁰ Aalders (1953), 214.

does not have much to do with the literary tradition of prose encomium or early biography, but is a feature shared with almost all extant works by Xenophon. In my view, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* is an application of his theory of moral education into literary composition. It marks Xenophon's original contribution to the formation and development of ancient biography and his lasting influence in history of western literature.

IV. Xenophon as Founder of Moral Tradition in Classical Biographical Composition

Among ancient biographers, Plutarch, a Platonist and follower of Xenophon's biographical tradition, best summarises biography's function of moral exemplification:

ὅθεν οὐδ' ὠφελεῖ τὰ τοιαῦτα τοὺς θεωμένους, πρὸς ἃ μιμητικὸς οὐ γίνεται ζῆλος οὐδὲ ἀνάδοσις κινουῖσα προθυμίαν καὶ ὁρμὴν ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξομοίωσιν. ἀλλ' ἢ γε ἀρετὴ ταῖς πράξεσιν εὐθὺς οὕτω διατίθησιν, ὥσθ' ἅμα θαυμάζεσθαι τὰ ἔργα καὶ ζηλοῦσθαι τοὺς εἰργασμένους. τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τῆς τύχης ἀγαθῶν τὰς κτήσεις καὶ ἀπολαύσεις, τῶν δ' ἀπ' ἀρετῆς τὰς πράξεις ἀγαπῶμεν, καὶ τὰ μὲν ἡμῖν παρ' ἐτέρων, τὰ δὲ μᾶλλον ἐτέροις παρ' ἡμῶν ὑπάρχειν βουλόμεθα. τὸ γὰρ καλὸν ἐφ' αὐτὸ πρακτικῶς κινεῖ καὶ πρακτικὴν εὐθὺς ὁρμὴν ἐντίθησιν, ἡθοιοιοῦν οὐ τῇ μιμήσει τὸν θεατὴν, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τοῦ ἔργου τὴν προαίρεσιν παρεχόμενον.

Wherefore the spectator is not advantaged by those things at sight of which no ardour for imitation arises in the breast, nor any uplift of the soul arousing zealous impulses to do the like. But virtuous action straightway so disposes a man that he no sooner admires the works of virtue than he strives to emulate those who wrought them. The good things of Fortune we love to possess and enjoy; those of Virtue we love to perform. The former we are willing should be ours at the hands of others; the latter we wish that others rather should have at

our hands. The Good creates a stir of activity towards itself, and implants at once in the spectator an active impulse; it does not form his character by ideal representation alone, but through the investigation of its work it furnishes him with a dominant purpose. (Plut. *Vit. Per.* 2.2-3; cf. Plut. *Vit. Tim.* 1.1-4.)

Xenophon never explains the use of moral examples in his biography (or prose encomium) in any of his extant works. But in my opinion, his intention of composing the *Agesilaus* must be quite similar to the statement of Plutarch above, as this idea is perfectly in accordance to his thought of social education discussed in Part 2. As K.J. Dover points out, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* deals in succession with the king's 'piety, honesty and uprightness, temperance and chastity, courage, intelligence and skill, and so on'.⁵³¹ All these virtues are highly moral and are indirectly connected to Xenophon's idea of social education. According to Xenophon's systematic presentation of his theory of moral education, a competent political leader is the key figure of such kind of education (the *Cyropaedia*); he should be aware that good leadership can lead to happiness of both his subjects and himself (the *Hiero*); in order to overcome all kinds of obstacles in harsh life against his work, certain immoral means are indispensable for achieving the ultimate virtue (the dark side); the ideal political leader should set up a great moral example for people around him (Cyrus the Great in the *Cyropaedia*), impose strict discipline (Xenophon himself in the *Anabasis*), make wise laws (Lycurgus in the *Spartan Constitution*), know how to enrich his people (advice for Athenian officers in the *Poroi*), and create a perfect morality in a philosophical sense throughout the whole society (Simonides' advice in the *Hiero*). Nevertheless, according to Xenophon's own narrative, the perfect social systems in Cyrus the Great's Persia and in Lycurgus' Sparta both collapsed after the two heroes' death. In that case, recording heroes' wise words and noble deeds is the best way to keep their example and influence alive and one useful tool for social education of morality. As Plutarch says, the best way of pursuing virtue is the

⁵³¹ Dover (1974), 66.

automatic imitation of good deeds of heroes (Plut. *Vit. Per.* 2.2-3).

In my opinion, Xenophon's *Agésilas* is produced under the guidelines of his own theory of moral education. Agesilaus, the Spartan king and an excellent military general, shares a lot of common features with ideal political leaders appearing in Xenophon's other works. Here it would be quite helpful if we compare Agesilaus' character with the corresponding contents of the four chapters of Part 2 above.

Like Cyrus the Great in the *Cyropaedia* (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.14; 3.3.58-59; 8.1.26; 8.1.30 ; 8.1.34-37; 8.7.10), Xenophon's Agesilaus is good at enriching his friends and gains profits for his comrades after the victory in Phrygia by his wisdom (Xen. *Ages.* 1.17-19). He has great reverence for religion (Xen. *Ages.* 3.2) and is pious to gods all his life (Xen. *Ages.* 3.5). He is just in rewarding (Xen. *Ages.* 4.1) and manages his money well (Xen. *Ages.* 8.8). His endurance is striking and he toils willingly beyond all others (Xen. *Ages.* 5.3). He is full of courage (Xen. *Ages.* 6.1) and wins countless victories in battle (Xen. *Ages.* 6.3). He is full of wisdom (Xen. *Ages.* 6.4), but is also loyal to his fatherland (Xen. *Ages.* 6.4; 7.1). He respects the constitution (Xen. *Ages.* 2.16) and established laws (Xen. *Ages.* 7.2). In the *Agésilas*, Xenophon also contrasts his hero's agreeability and simplicity with the Persian king's arrogance and luxury (Xen. *Ages.* 9.1-2; 9.3-5). This comparison is very similar to the one Xenophon draws between social moralities in Cyrus the Great's reign and in later times (Xen. *Cyr.* 8.8.2-26). In sum, the glorious image of Agesilaus is almost another version of Cyrus the Great and there is no doubt that the *Agésilas* borrows a lot of elements from the theory of social education in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*.

In the case of the *Hiero*, Xenophon's Agesilaus also presents certain virtues correspondent to Simonides' advice for Hiero. Agesilaus is gentle and treats his subjects and captives with love and care (Xen. *Ages.* 1.20-22). He sticks to the principle of moderation and keeps himself away from any strong pleasures (Xen. *Ages.* 5.1-2). He is hospitable and generous in dispensing his money (Xen. *Ages.* 8.1). He also refrains from attending public chariot games (Xen. *Ages.* 9.6-7) in

accordance with Simonides' admonition for Hiero (Xen. *Hier.* 11.5-8).

It is noteworthy that in this encomium Xenophon does not deny that his hero is equally expert in playing tricks and gathering money, which might seem to be something not quite honourable in the eyes of his audience. He was good at playing tricks and showed Tissaphernes 'to be a child at deception' (Xen. *Ages.* 1.17). He 'contrived that his allies always had the better of them [enemies], by the use of deception when occasion offered, by anticipating their action if speed was necessary, by hiding when it suited his purpose, and by practising all the opposite methods when dealing with enemies to those which he applied when dealing with friends' (Xen. *Ages.* 6.5-7). In his old age, as Sparta was in short of money to make friends with other cities (Xen. *Ages.* 2.25), Agesilaus 'applied himself to the business of raising money' (Xen. *Ages.* 2.25) and used to collect large sums of money in Egypt for his own country (Xen. *Ages.* 2.31). These descriptions show a high level of similarity to Xenophon's theory of social and moral education.

In conclusion, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* is the representation and synthesis of the ideal heroes in his works on social and moral education. In Xenophon's words, Agesilaus is 'the perfect embodiment of goodness (ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς παντελῶς)' (Xen. *Ages.* 10.1). 'He was never despised by his foes, never brought to account by the citizens, never blamed by his friends, but throughout his career he was praised and idolised by the entire world.' (Xen. *Ages.* 6.8) And what such an ideal general cares about most is 'guiding them [his people] to all virtue' (Xen. *Ages.* 10.2). As Cartledge comments, Xenophon was actually teaching his own philosophy by the example of Agesilaus.⁵³² In Xenophon's mind, the function of his *Agesilaus* must be important and ambitious. It keeps the example and positive influence of his ideal heroes alive,⁵³³ and ensures the lasting effect of moral education. Xenophon himself proudly summarised at the very end of the *Agesilaus*: 'he (Agesilaus) proved that,

⁵³² Cartledge (1987), 414.

⁵³³ Higgins (1973), 80.

though the bodily strength decays, the vigour of good men's souls is ageless.'⁵³⁴

V. Adjustment and Development of Xenophon's Moral Theory in his *Agésilas*

Paul Cartledge observes that the content of ἀρετή in Xenophon's *Agésilas* is more traditional than that in his other works.⁵³⁵ This view is generally true and the phenomenon is understandable, as this work was written for public readers. However, this does not mean that the moral exemplification in the *Agésilas* contains nothing innovative at all. One feature of Xenophon's *Agésilas* is noteworthy and rarely appears in his other works except for the *Anabasis*. That is the recognition of pan-Hellenistic patriotism as an important kind of ἀρετή.

Of course, pan-Hellenism is a modern term created after the usage of pan-Germanism and pan-Slavism in the middle of the nineteenth century. But the spirit it describes did exist in classical writers' works, such as Isocrates' *Panegyricus*. And Xenophon's *Agésilas* is also a 'pan-Hellenist' par excellence,⁵³⁶ who is kept mentioned as φιλέλλην (a Greek-lover) and μισοπέρσης (a Persian-hater).⁵³⁷ Xenophon claims in the *Agésilas* that 'if it is honourable in one who is a Greek to be a friend to the Greeks, what other general has the world seen unwilling to take a city when he thought that it would be sacked, or who looked on victory in a war against Greeks as a disaster?' (Xen. *Ages.* 7.4) This passage indicates that in Xenophon and his contemporary audiences' mind, the love of Greece and the hatred of Persia must be considered as a moral virtue.⁵³⁸ Agésilas felt sad when he heard the news that his army had killed 1000 enemies at the battle of Corinth (Xen. *Ages.* 7.5), and, in order to unite all Greeks, refused to capture Corinth (Xen. *Ages.* 7.6). He

⁵³⁴ Xen. *Ages.* 11.14. Its tone is similar to and perhaps imitated from Bacchyl. 3.90-92 (in Snell).

⁵³⁵ Cartledge (1987), 143.

⁵³⁶ Cartledge (1987), 180.

⁵³⁷ Xen. *Ages.* 1.7-8, 34, 36; 6.1; 7.4-7; 8.3, 5. See Millender (2012), 417; Harman (2012), 451.

⁵³⁸ This idea does not contradict with the outlook presented in the *Cyropaedia*. Xenophon, as well as many other classical writers, such as Aeschylus, Herodotus and Isocrates, takes Persia in Cyrus the Great's age as a great success but condemns its evilness and its interference and invasion of Greece. See relevant discussion in Part 1, Chapter 1 of this thesis.

spoke frankly to a Persian envoy who was trying to make an alliance with him on behalf of the Persian king: ‘Tell his Majesty that there is no need for him to send me private letters, but, if he gives proof of friendship for Lacedaemon and good will towards Greece, I on my part will be his friend with all my heart. But if he is found plotting against them, let him not hope to have a friend in me, however many letters I may receive.’ (Xen. *Ages.* 8.3)

In the historical context of the mid-fourth century B.C., the most important and urgent aim of pan-Hellenists was to unite the Greeks to fight against the powerful Persian Empire. In that aspect Xenophon’s *Agesilaus* was again a pioneer.⁵³⁹ According to Xenophon, his offensive expedition in Asia Minor in his youth was guided by ‘his eagerness to pay back the Persian in his own coin for the former invasion of Greece’ (Xen. *Ages.* 1.8). And he still endeavoured to ‘inflict a crushing defeat on the enemy of the Greeks’ in his senior age (Xen. *Ages.* 2.31). Even when Sparta was at war with other Greeks, Agesilaus still ‘did not neglect the common good of Greece, but went out with a fleet to do what harm he could to the barbarian’ (Xen. *Ages.* 7.7). In Xenophon’s encomium, Agesilaus is the symbol of pan-Hellenism and Greek patriotism and sets up a glorious example for a miserable Greek world suffering from the endless inner wars and closing menace of the Persian Empire.

As Cartledge and other scholars point out, the Pan-Hellenic image of Agesilaus is largely a fiction created by Xenophon. Even Xenophon himself is clearly aware of it.⁵⁴⁰ As a patriot faithful to not only Athens but also the whole Greek world, Xenophon acutely grasped the current need of the unity of Greeks, and tried his best to persuade and educate his contemporaries by the Pan-Hellenic example set up in his prose encomium. This innovation proves again that the *Agesilaus* is not an unoriginal and imitative work, but a creative writing reflecting Xenophon’s wisdom

⁵³⁹ Delebecque (1957), 467.

⁵⁴⁰ Millender (2012), 418.

and advocating for some moral virtues badly in need of in his time.

VI. Influence of the *Agesilaus*

Judging from its later reception, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* must be the most popular of his 'minor works'. His glorious image of Agesilaus was widely accepted; and the style of focusing on morality and the art of moral exemplification in Xenophon's prose encomium influenced later development of ancient biography.

First, Xenophon succeeded in creating an impressive image of Agesilaus⁵⁴¹ as the owner of ideal morality. His prose encomium was widely read in the later antiquity, especially in the Roman Age. A comparison of the following texts would be revealing:

Agesilaus of Sparta, who would not allow representations of himself in paintings or sculpture, is no less pertinent to my case than those who took pains over the matter. Xenophon's one little volume in eulogy of that king has achieved far more than all the portraits and statues under the sun. (Cic. *Fam.* 5.12.7)

Indeed you may well laugh at these doings; but in all seriousness, it has occurred to me to congratulate Agesilaus, king of Sparta, on the stand he took, for he never thought it fitting to have either a statue or a portrait made of himself, not because he was deformed, as people say, and short — for what was to hinder the statue's being tall, or having shapely legs, like Euphranor's Hephaestus? — but rather because he saw clearly that one should not try to prolong the allotted span of human life or expose the body to the vicissitudes of stone or bronze. Would that it might be possible to take leave even of the body which we have! (Dio Chrys. *Or.* 37.43)

On his [Agesilaus'] way home from Egypt death came to him, and in his last hours he gave directions to those with him that they should not cause to be made

⁵⁴¹ Cartledge (1987), 414.

any sculptured or painted or imitative representation of his person. ‘For if I have done any goodly deed, that shall be my memorial; but if not, then not all the statues in the world, the works of menial and worthless men, will avail.’ (Plut. *Mor.* 215a)

It is easy to recognise that Cicero, Dio Chrysostom and Plutarch — three famous classical writers living in different places — talked about the same issue, and all their materials ultimately come from the ending part of Xenophon’s *Agesilaus* (Xen. *Ages.* 11.7). Therefore we can see clearly that simplicity, a virtue Xenophon advocated and expressed through the example of Agesilaus, was actually ‘taught’ by Cicero among Roman elites, by Dio Chrysostom among the populace in Asia Minor, by Plutarch among students of philosophy on the Greek mainland more than 400 years after Xenophon’s and Agesilaus’ age, and takes roots in ancient cultural tradition as an everlasting memory of the Spartan king.

Similarly, Xenophon reports in his prose encomium that Agesilaus was loyal to his fatherland and returned at full speed from Asia Minor (Xen. *Ages.* 2.1), this dramatic topic is also borrowed by Nepos and Plutarch for moral teachings in their own time. Nepos followed Xenophon’s narrative and exclaimed that it is ‘an example that I only wish our generals had been willing to follow! (cuius exemplum utinam imperatores nostri sequi uoluissent!)’ (Nep. *Vit. Ages.* 4.2) Plutarch also compared Agesilaus’ loyalty with that of Alexander and Hannibal, and praised the greatness of this Spartan king (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 15.4). This instance offers further evidence of Xenophon’s success.

The image of Agesilaus, chiefly moulded by Xenophon, remained popular in late antiquity and Renaissance. At the end of the fourth century, Synesius of Cyrene cited Agesilaus as a splendid model in his work *On Kingship* written for the emperor Arcadius.⁵⁴² In 501, Procopius of Gaza called the emperor Anastasius ‘the new

⁵⁴² Cartledge (1987), 419.

Agesilaus' in his panegyric.⁵⁴³ In Renaissance, Agesilaus was the favourite ancient Spartan and was admired by Machiavelli and other intellectuals as a patriotic national hero who fought valiantly against the barbarians (a metaphor for contemporary Turks menacing the safety of Western Europe) for the sake of Greece.⁵⁴⁴ Of course, the image of Agesilaus was also partly shaped by Xenophon's *Hellenica* and Plutarch's *Life of Agesilaus*, but the contribution of Xenophon's *Agesilaus* remains undeniable.

Second, Xenophon's *Agesilaus* brings the art of moral edification into prose encomium, which became an established tradition in later biographies, therefore imposed certain influence on the development of ancient biographical literature.

Though both history and biography remained almost shapeless in Xenophon's time, their definite and distinctive traditions were firmly established in the Roman period through the development of the Hellenistic Age. Both Nepos (Nep. *Vit. Pel.* 1.1) and Plutarch (Plutarch, *Vit. Alex.* 1.1-3) clarified consciously in their lives that what they wrote was biography, not history. The key feature of ancient biography is summarised well by Patricia Cox:

Ancient biographies are constellations of such gestures, carefully selected and assembled not to chronicle a life's history but to suggest its character. These character-revealing gestures are prepared in the biographies primarily by means of images and anecdotes, and they show the free play of the biographical imagination as it works in the service of history's 'meaning'. If the facts of history form the 'landscape' of a man's life, character is its 'inscape', the contours and hollows which give a landscape its individuality. Biographies are like caricatures, bringing landscape and inscape, event and character, together in a single moment of evocative expression.⁵⁴⁵

It is indisputable that Xenophon's *Agesilaus* plays an important role in the

⁵⁴³ Cartledge (1987), 419.

⁵⁴⁴ Cartledge (1987), 420.

⁵⁴⁵ Cox (1983), xi.

formation of this tradition.⁵⁴⁶ This encomium focuses on the observation of character, and is intended for moral edification.⁵⁴⁷ Even Friedrich Leo, a German scholar obviously biased against Xenophon, has to admit that his *Agésilas* established an important tradition for later biographers⁵⁴⁸ such as Nepos and Suetonius.⁵⁴⁹ It is hard to establish a direct connection between Xenophon and Suetonius; but his influence on Nepos and Plutarch is quite obvious. As Cartledge says, Nepos' *Life of Agésilas* is heavily dependent on Xenophon's *Agésilas*.⁵⁵⁰ The case for Plutarch is more complex. In his *Life of Agésilas*, Plutarch mentions the name of Xenophon twice (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 4.1-2; 19.6). Unlike Nepos, Plutarch is not lacking in critical spirit⁵⁵¹ and consults many materials besides Xenophon.⁵⁵² He supplements certain negative materials for Agésilas (Plut. *Vit. Ages.* 20.5-6), criticised his immoral means against Leotydidés (Plut. *Comparison of Agésilas and Pompey*, 1) and Lysander (Plut. *Comparison of Agésilas and Pompey*, 2). In spite of this, Plutarch's presentation of Agésilas is on the whole 'as favourable as that of Xenophon'.⁵⁵³ He adopted Xenophon's art of moral exemplification⁵⁵⁴ and even imitated the latter's language and phrasing.⁵⁵⁵ The impact of Xenophon on the first extant Latin biography and the greatest Greek biography in the ancient world further secures the spread and influence of his prose encomium *Agésilas*.

The merit of Xenophon's tendency of moral edification in the ancient biographical tradition remains controversial. Viewing it from a modern historical perspective, Michael Grant complains that it is quite harmful to the reliability of material presented in later ancient biographies.⁵⁵⁶ Yet Philip A. Stadter claims that

⁵⁴⁶ Grant (1970), 166.

⁵⁴⁷ Cox (1983), 8-9.

⁵⁴⁸ Leo (1901), 215.

⁵⁴⁹ Leo (1901), 239.

⁵⁵⁰ Cartledge (1987), 418.

⁵⁵¹ Cartledge (1987), 418.

⁵⁵² Cartledge (1987), 70.

⁵⁵³ Cartledge (1987), 418.

⁵⁵⁴ Shipley (1997), v.

⁵⁵⁵ Shipley (1997), 49.

⁵⁵⁶ Grant (1970), 135.

Plutarch's ability 'to use historical figures to contemplate the play of human qualities in action, to reveal the specific cast vices and virtues assume in the contingent world of political leadership and strife' is his 'greatest attraction'.⁵⁵⁷ In any case, it is safe to conclude that Xenophon's *Agesilaus* is not merely an imitation of Isocrates' *Evagoras*. It is innovative because it focuses on moral virtues and makes use of moral exemplification under the guideline of Xenophon's own theory of moral education to persuade public readers to adopt a virtuous way of life; and some virtues advocated in the *Agesilaus*, for example the pan-Hellenic patriotism, actually reflects the new need of his time and enriches his theory of social education. Its influence on later biographical and historical works, both positive and negative, should not be neglected by modern scholars and deserves serious treatment.

⁵⁵⁷ Stadter (1992), 1.

Chapter 2: Queen Bee and Housewife: Extension of Social Education into the Private Sphere in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*⁵⁵⁸

Among the primary documents on classical Greek society, most historical, political works and even poems and dialogues focus on the public sphere only and talk about political or military subjects. Detailed works on the private sphere are very rare. As an exception to the general rule, Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* is quite noteworthy as a dialogue on domestic affairs. Nevertheless, due to the lack of external evidence and ambiguity of its background, there is disputation about the nature of the content of this valuable work among scholars, which lasts from the age of Roman Empire up to now.

As an Epicurean living in the first century B.C., Philodemus takes the *Oeconomicus* as a philosophical work, and declares that he cannot understand fully some ideas in it. According to his view, the philosopher Socrates should not study how to make money by domestic labour. Following the doctrine of Epicurus, he believes that wife and family are not indispensable elements of happiness. And he also comments that the assertion of Socrates in the dialogue that a husband should be responsible for his wife's faults in family life is absurd (Philodemus, *Oeconomica*, 6.1-20). Modern scholars pay more attention to the historical value of the *Oeconomicus*. L.R. Shero declares that the prototype of the 'good wife' in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* must be his own wife Philesia, which deserves further historical research.⁵⁵⁹ Stewart Irvin Oost takes a far more conservative opinion than Shero, yet he also agrees that the *Oeconomicus* is a historical record about the opinion of Athenian aristocrats on family and gender, because, according to his opinion, Xenophon's thought cannot be original and must be based on some

⁵⁵⁸ One article of mine whose main content is based on this chapter was published in *Journal of Cambridge Studies*, Vol.6, Issue 4 (2011), 145-162.

⁵⁵⁹ Shero (1932), 19.

borrowed ideas.⁵⁶⁰ As one of the most important researchers of the *Oeconomicus* since the end of the twentieth century, Sarah B. Pomeroy claims that the work is both ‘the only extant Greek didactic work to draw attention to the importance of the *oikos* as an economic entity’,⁵⁶¹ and a book which ‘covers a wide range of subjects including agriculture, philosophy, and social, military, intellectual, and economic history’.⁵⁶² In 1994, she published the most academic and up-to-date commentary in English of the *Oeconomicus* so far, in which she translates the whole text of the dialogue, summarises the scholarship on the *Oeconomicus* since the classical age,⁵⁶³ and discusses in detail the information of gender, family, housework, economics and religion contained in the book.⁵⁶⁴ One of her basic opinions on the nature of the *Oeconomicus* is that it is the product of Xenophon’s frustration after his misfortune in political and mercenary career and exile, and draws his attention from the public sphere to the domestic economy.⁵⁶⁵ Leah Kronenbera also claims that the *Oeconomicus* serves as a critique of political life and suggests a life of philosophy instead.⁵⁶⁶ Gabriel Danzig puts forth another innovative view that the external form of the *Oeconomicus* is a guide on practical affairs similar to Ovid’s *Ars Amatoria*, while its nature is an ethical dialogue under the disguise of an economics treatise⁵⁶⁷.

Due to the absence of decisive evidence of the date and background of the *Oeconomicus*, it is not easy to determine the very nature of this complex work. However, in my opinion, the examples, theoretical system and detailed assertions in the *Oeconomicus* itself provide certain valuable clues to later readers, which may help us to gain a better understanding of the origin and character of this important dialogue.

⁵⁶⁰ Oost (1978), 225.

⁵⁶¹ Pomeroy (2010), 31.

⁵⁶² Pomeroy (1994), vii.

⁵⁶³ Too (1995), 247.

⁵⁶⁴ Bradley (1999), 477.

⁵⁶⁵ Pomeroy (1994), 5.

⁵⁶⁶ Kronenbera (2009), 72.

⁵⁶⁷ Danzig (2003), 57.

I. Queen Bee in the *Oeconomicus*

For a start, it may be helpful for us to examine the *Oeconomicus* 7.17-37. Ischomachus, a character in the dialogue who represents the conventional virtues of the polis and the ideal ideological core of the whole work,⁵⁶⁸ advises his wife to pay more attention to the organisation of housework and says, ‘I suppose that they are not trivial matters, unless, of course, the activities that the queen bee (ἡ ἐν τῷ σμῆνι ἡγεμὼν μέλιττα, literally ‘the female bee in charge in the hive’) presides over in the hive are trivial.’ (Xen. *Oec.* 7.17) Afterwards he patiently explains to his wife the responsibility of the queen bee: she presides over the hive, sends bees out to work instead of allowing them to wander around; she keeps in mind everything taken into the hive and manages to keep it safe until it is to be consumed, and then distributes it justly among the bees; she supervises the construction of combs and ensures that they are built firmly as well as quickly; she also takes charge of the tending of offspring and sends new-born bees out of the hive when they are mature enough (Xen. *Oec.* 7.33-34).

At first sight, we must admit that the queen bee described and the idealised housewife do share common features. Nevertheless, if we study the vocabulary and content of this text closely, it is not hard to recognise that the responsibility of queen bee is far more political than domestic. In order to clarify this point further, it is necessary for us to analyse briefly the image of bees as a typical symbol in classical works.

The bees described by writers of pre-classical period are generally mystical but are still informative for us. The most famous description of bees come from Hesiod’s *Theogony*, in which he claims that the race of female women, ‘a great woe for mortals, dwelling with men, no companions of baneful poverty but only of luxury’, is just like drones, who enjoy their lives in the white honey-combs built by bees and

⁵⁶⁸ Kronenbera (2009), 37.

‘gather into their stomachs the labor of others’ (Hes. *Theog.* 590-599). Another noteworthy myth comes from the work of Semonides of Amorgos, who says that the most hard-working women come from bees, which manage household well and ‘grow old in love with a loving husband’, and are therefore ‘the best and the most sensible whom Zeus bestows as a favour on men’ (Semon. 7.83-93).

It is hard to make sure whether Xenophon was inspired by the two poems mentioned above directly. It seems that at least Xenophon does not borrow the image of bees from Hesiod directly, as the latter compares women to evil drones instead of diligent queen bees. And we also cannot tell if Xenophon knows Semonides’ poem. But it is certain that in Greek cultural tradition bees are sometimes connected with females and the quality of diligence in work, the meaning of which is just what Xenophon wants to express here.

Nevertheless, I would argue that Xenophon actually wishes to say more than that. In fact, the image of queen bee in Greek literature is highly political. The clearest evidence of the attitude of Xenophon’s contemporaries to bees comes from Aristotle’s zoological writings. In the *Generation of Animals*, Aristotle divides the members in the hive into bee (μελίττα), drone (κηφήν) and king (βασιλεύς) (Arist. *IA*. 759a19-22). The Greek vocabulary βασιλεύς is clearly political. In the *Historia Animalium*, Aristotle further points out that there is complex and strict social orders among bees, most of which are governed by two kinds of ‘leaders’, who are in themselves distinguished by red and dark colours and differ in dignity (Arist. *Hist. an.* 553a27-29). According to the theory in the *Historia Animalium*, bees, human beings, wasps and cranes are the four ‘political animals (πολιτικάί)’, who share among themselves ‘public work (κοινὸν ἔργον)’ (Arist. *Hist. an.* 488a2-9). Even political struggles in human society can also occur among bees. Aristotle believes that if there are too many ‘rulers’ in one hive, the community is to be destroyed by the disaster of partisan division (Arist. *Hist. an.* 553b18-19).

Even more convincing evidence comes from Xenophon’s own writings. It is

noteworthy that Xenophon does not apply the metaphor of bees only here, but also in his *Cyropaedia* and *Hellenica*, in both cases queen bee clearly signifies political leader. In the *Cyropaedia* Artabazus says to Cyrus the Great, ‘for my part, O my king, for to me you seem to be a born king no less than is the sovereign of the bees in a hive. For as the bees always willingly obey the queen bee and none of them deserts the place where she stays; and as none fails to follow her if she goes anywhere else — so marvelous a yearning to be ruled by her is innate to them; so also do men seem to me to be drawn by something like the same sort of instinct toward you.’⁵⁶⁹ And in the *Hellenica* Xenophon narrates, ‘but it chanced that Thrasydaeus was still asleep at the very place where he had become drunk. And when the commons learned that he was not dead, they gathered round his house on all sides, as a swarm of bees around its leader.’ (Xen. *Hell.* 3.2.28) So it is quite evident that queen bee actually stands for a competent political leader or military general in Xenophon’s mind.

Fabio Roscalla further argues that the metaphor of queen bee actually comes from a political belief widely held in Persia, that the Persian King is the queen bee of his people. Besides the passage cited above from Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*, their evidence includes that Aeschylus calls Persian soldiers ‘a swarm of bees, having left the hive with the leader of their army’ (Aesch. *Per.* 126-131); and there is also an apparent allusion to the king of Assyria as bee in *Isaiah* 7.18.⁵⁷⁰ In any case, it is quite safe to conclude that queen bee can represent political leader as well as woman and labour in classical cultural context. Any well-educated Greek readers of the *Oeconomicus* can realise the political sense of the queen bee metaphor and there is no doubt Xenophon himself understands that clearly, too.

So does Xenophon use an improper example here? In my opinion it is not the case. After reading the *Oeconomicus* thoroughly, we can discover that the author draws connections and comparisons between the private and public spheres

⁵⁶⁹ Xen. *Cyr.* 5.1.24-25. It is a bit odd that the leader of bees is taken as a ‘king bee’ here, which is different from Xenophon’s treatment of the subject in the *Oeconomicus*. The specific reason of this remains unknown, while ancient Greeks, for example Aristotle (Arist. *IA.* 759a19-22) does take queen bee as masculine.

⁵⁷⁰ For more detail, see Brock (2004), 254.

intentionally, and attempts to apply his thought on social education of morality to construct his mode of domestic administration. The private life in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* is not the antithesis of the political sphere; and it is far from a historical record of his own experience or the typical mode of Athenian family management. It is an extension and application of the social educational theory of Xenophon, which is predominant in his thought.

II. Application of Experience in the Public Sphere in Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*

a. Instances Drawn from Political and Military Life

As a matter of fact, not only does the queen bee analogy have a potential political meaning, but most of the instances in the *Oeconomicus* are taken from political and military life. In 5.15-16, Socrates says, 'And the man who leads his men against the enemy must contrive to produce the same result by giving gifts to those who behave as brave men should and punish those who disobey commands. On many occasions the farmer must encourage his workers no less than the general encourages his soldiers.' (Xen. *Oec.* 5.15-16) In 8.4-22, Xenophon applies four examples from the public sphere in succession. First, he uses the instances of army and navy to explain the necessity of obeying order in housework (Xen. *Oec.* 8.4-9). Then he describes how the sailors can place all kinds of tools on board perfectly well, which explains that it is helpful to sort and store domestic items in an orderly way (Xen. *Oec.* 8.11-16). Finally, Xenophon draws the comparison between shopping in a market and finding domestic items to prove that purposiveness is indispensable in family management (Xen. *Oec.* 8.22). Further, in 9.15, the author advises that a good housewife check everything at home from time to time, just as a general checks the guard; she must make sure that the tools are preserved well, similar to the official who is responsible to keep horses and cavalry in good fighting condition (Xen. *Oec.*

9.15). At the very end of the whole dialogue, Xenophon returns to analogies of sailors and soldiers once more. He points out that a good captain can command his sailors well enough to ensure the ship moving forward in full speed, while an inept captain cannot inspire the spirit of the sailors or avoid blame from them after the sailing. The case of general and soldiers in a battle is also the same. These rules can be applied perfectly well in housework (Xen. *Oec.* 21.2-8).

After reading these, it is no longer difficult to understand the tease of Socrates to Ischomachus in the dialogue, ‘By Hera, Ischomachus, you show that your wife has a masculine intelligence.’ (Xen. *Oec.* 10.1) That is because almost all instances Ischomachus shows to his wife are military or political, which prove the principle in the public sphere. According to classical Athenian concept, these affairs can be understood and put into practice by men, not by women. Of course, as the author is a mercenary soldier and military leader himself, the choice of examples must have something to do with his own experience and interest. But the frequent appearance and large proportion of political and military instances still reveal to some extent the reliance on experience and theory in the public sphere of the composition of the *Oeconomicus*, which makes Pomeroy’s description of it as the product of Xenophon’s frustration after his misfortune in public area seem less credible.

b. Adoption of Xenophon’s Theory of Social Education

A second character of the *Oeconomicus* is that its viewpoint with regard to the private sphere is strikingly similar to Xenophon’s theory of social education of morality. Judging from the propositions of Socrates and Ischomachus, the most important basis of household management is the competence of the husband and the housewife, who organises the housework on his behalf. The typical narrative of that view comes from the discussion between Socrates and Critobulus, a person who failed to manage his family well:

Socrates: And I can show you men who treat their wives so as to have fellow workers in improving their estates, while others treat them in such a way that they cause utter disaster.

Critobulus: And should the husband or the wife be blamed for this?

Socrates: Whenever a sheep is in a bad way, we usually blame the shepherd, and whenever a horse is vicious, we usually find fault with its rider. As for a wife, if she manages badly although she was taught what is right by her husband, perhaps it would be proper to blame her. But if he doesn't teach her what is right and good and then discovers that she has no knowledge of these qualities, wouldn't it be proper to blame the husband? (Xen. *Oec.* 3.10-11)

As the leading figure in the latter part of the dialogue, Ischomachus expresses the same opinion. When he finds that his wife does not understand how to keep the items in the household, he blames himself first: 'It's not your fault, but mine, because when I put the household into your hands, I failed to give you any instruction about where everything was to be put, so that you might know where you ought to put them away, and where to take them from.' (Xen. *Oec.* 8.2)

Furthermore, on behalf of the husband in the management of housework and serves as his 'second self',⁵⁷¹ the housewife is also responsible to teach useful skills to the servants nearby. Ischomachus admonishes his wife:

But, wife, your other special concerns turn out to be pleasant: wherever you take a slave who has no knowledge of spinning, and teach her that skill so that you double her value to you; and whenever you take one who does not know how to manage a house or serve, and turn her into one who is a skilled and faithful servant and make her invaluable... (Xen. *Oec.* 7.41)

According to the three paragraphs cited above, Xenophon's mode of household management is pithy and clear. Instead of scolding and punishing the servants directly, the husband should learn how to educate, help and supervise his wife; and

⁵⁷¹ Joshel and Murnaghan (1998), 15.

the ‘good housewife’ can teach the indispensable household managing skills to every servant in the family. However, what is noteworthy here is that this organising mode in the *Oeconomicus* is by no means original. Actually, it is direct application of the theory of social education set forth by Xenophon in his other historical and political works.

In my opinion, the way of argumentation in the *Oeconomicus* is an extension and transformation of the opening preface of Xenophon’s *Cyropaedia*. In the plot of the *Oeconomicus*, Critobulus is in sorrow because he cannot manage his private life well. Socrates shows him the great danger of ignoring the art of household management, and sets forth the example of Ischomachus as an example. While in the preface of the *Cyropaedia*, Xenophon deplores that:

The thought once occurred to us that how many democratic governments have been overthrown by people who preferred to live under any constitution other than democracy, and again, how many monarchies and how many oligarchies in times past have been abolished by the people. Moreover, We reflected that how many of those individuals who have aspired to absolute power have either been quickly deposed once for all; or if they hold their power, no matter for how short a time, they are objects of wonder as having proved to be wise and happy men. Then, too, we thought we had observed that even in private houses some people who had rather more than the usual number of servants and some also who had only a very few were quite unable to assert their authority over even those few, though nominally they are masters. (Xen. *Cyr.* 1.1.1)

Then the remaining part of the work introduces Cyrus the Great, in order to show how he managed to construct excellent social order and public morality by political skills and mature constitution, so as to avoid the disasters mentioned above and achieve the aim of social education, that is to say the elevation of morality of his subjects and the harmony of the whole society; and his mode of administration is also very similar to that of Ischomachus.

Again, in Xenophon's *Spartan Constitution*, the image of the Spartan king Lycurgus is of the same nature as Cyrus the Great and Ischomachus. Xenophon comments, 'Lycurgus, who gave them the laws that they obey, and to which they owe their prosperity, I do regard with wonder; and I think that he reached the utmost limit of wisdom.' (Xen. *Lac.* 1.1-2) According to this narrative, through wise legislation, strict supervision and his own demonstrative behaviour, Lycurgus successfully set up admirable morality and public order in Spartan society, and laid the basis of Spartan prosperity and hegemony in future generations. Therefore, wise legislation and people's obedience to law are of crucial importance for the elevation of morality. In the *Poroi*, another work apparently composed in his later years, Xenophon also admits that it is the core theory in his political and historical concept (Xen. *Vect.* 1.1). Here we can still recognise theory of the public sphere but which is also similar to the statement in the *Oeconomicus*, that competent leaders and strict regulation can ensure the efficiency of an organisation. In the *Oeconomicus*, Ischomachus and the ideal housewife just play the role of educator like Cyrus and Lycurgus in household as the latter two did in Persia and Sparta. They represent perfect characters to people around themselves and serve as models of morality just as Cyrus does. Like Lycurgus, they make rules for servants and make sure that these regulations should be obeyed.

In the ideal model of the *Oeconomicus*, what goes hand in hand with being a good husband and housewife is reasonable household order and laws. Ischomachus says to his wife, 'For there is nothing, wife, as useful or good for people as order. For instance, a chorus is composed of people. But whenever every member does whatever he likes, there is simply chaos, and it is not a pleasant spectacle. But when they act and sing in an orderly manner, these same persons seem to be both worth watching and worth hearing.' (Xen. *Oec.* 8.3) Ischomachus further stresses that one of the key role of good housewife is as guardian of 'household law (νομοφύλαξ ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ)' (Xen. *Oec.* 9.15). In context, household law ensures that everything at home

is placed in order and all the servants receive rewards and punishments they deserve according to their behaviour. This idea also comes from Xenophon's political beliefs. He expresses the idea in many works that rational and respected laws are of key importance for social moral education. In the *Spartan Constitution*, one major aspect of education for Spartan children is to educate them to respect law (Xen. *Lac.* 4.6). The constitution of Lycurgus places Spartan youths under the supervision of law at all times (Xen. *Lac.* 2.10-11). And this kind of law not only prevents people from committing crimes, but also forces them to improve their own living condition by just means (Xen. *Lac.* 10.5). One criticism in the *Hiero* against tyrants is also that they ignore law and public order themselves, therefore fail to set up worthy examples to their people (Xen. *Hier.* 4.10-11). Therefore the household order and law in the *Oeconomicus* is also connected closely to public law regulating social orders.

A third suggestion in the *Oeconomicus* is to reward and punish properly, which is naturally connected with the household law and is one of the most important means of training qualified servants. In Ischomachus' view, the most important way to inspire slaves to work hard is to provide enough food for them when they perform well (Xen. *Oec.* 13.9). The husband and the foreman should also make sure that 'the clothing and the shoes for the workers are not identical, but some are of inferior quality and others superior', so that they can 'reward the better workers with superior garments and give the inferior ones to the less deserving' (Xen. *Oec.* 13.10-12). Parallel arguments appear in Xenophon's political biography and dialogue, too. In the *Agesilaus*, Xenophon praises Agesilaus because he mastered the art of rewarding his friends (Xen. *Ages.* 1.17-19). In the *Hiero* he also suggests that a good king should know when to bestow his wealth for his people's happiness in order to win favour for himself (Xen. *Hier.* 11.1). Even in some less important statements we can also notice the influence of Xenophon's theory of the public sphere and moral admonition. The emphasis on the loyalty of the foreman in 12.5 reminds us of the belief that loyalty is the first and most important virtue for general in the *Agesilaus*

(Xen. *Ages.* 2.1); while the necessity to respect the will of gods before engaging in agriculture also accords the narrative in the *Anabasis* on the importance of prophecy before battle.⁵⁷² In conclusion, a lot of evidence proves that the major points in the *Oeconomicus* come directly from Xenophon's thought on political and military affairs, especially his suggestions for social education of morality in the *Cyropaedia*, *Hiero* and *Spartan Constitution*. Xenophon believes that experiences and theories in the public sphere are totally applicable for family life, and borrows them in his *Oeconomicus* without much transformation.

c. Corresponding Nature of Domestic Organisers and Political Leaders

Still more convincing evidence is that Xenophon himself points out in the *Oeconomicus* frequently that household management is one important aspect of the monarch's art of government. In 4.4, Socrates states that agriculture and army are the two most important things in Persian kings' eyes. The greatest Persian king, Cyrus the Great, often rewarded excellent farmers, and what he was good at is 'cultivating land and defending the land he had cultivated' (Xen. *Oec.* 4.16). The reason why Persian kings value agriculture might be the concern for the food supply only, not his interest in housework. But it seems that Xenophon already indicates here the correspondence between household management and political governance. A more obvious proof exists in the dialogue between Ischomachus and Socrates. Ischomachus is worried that though his way to control slaves is efficient, it is so simple and primary that he may be laughed at by Socrates. But Socrates answers him and says:

It certainly is no laughing matter, Ischomachus. You know, whoever can make people skilled in governing men can obviously also make them masters of men; and whoever can make people skilled masters can also make people skilled to be

⁵⁷² Danzig (2003), 72.

kings. So the person who can do this seems to me to deserve great praise, not laughter. (Xen. *Oec.* 13.5)

Furthermore, according to Ischomachus' statement, the law of city-states can be directly used in household management.⁵⁷³ He himself applies certain regulations in the laws of Draco and Solon in order to teach his slaves to be honest (Xen. *Oec.* 14.4). Therefore, it is clear that in Xenophon's mind the application of public law into household management is not only practical but also beneficial and praiseworthy. Ischomachus also refers to some laws of Persian kings, because they regulate how to reward the honest people (Xen. *Oec.* 14.6-7), and serve as a supplement of those of Draco and Solon, which emphasise punishment too much. In my opinion, the utilisation of public laws in family management is not only Ischomachus' suggestion here, but also the basic idea and approach by which Xenophon applies to compose the *Oeconomicus* himself.

On the other hand, an ideal household manager should also possess the quality of king.⁵⁷⁴ Ischomachus tells his wife that she should 'praise and honour a worthy member of the household to the best of her ability, like a queen, and scold and punish anyone who deserves it.' (Xen. *Oec.* 9.15) In the conclusion of the whole work, he once more emphasises the correspondence between a good household manager and a wise king: if the workers 'are stimulated when the master appears and a new vigour descends on each of the workers and mutual rivalry and an ambition in each worker to be the best, I would say that this master possesses a portion of the nature of a king.' (Xen. *Oec.* 21.10)

In sum, as one of the few ancient Greek works to discuss the private sphere, the *Oeconomicus* borrows largely from circumstances, experiences and even figures of the public sphere. Most examples in the work come from political and military life; the suggestion shown in the dialogue is actually a transformed version of

⁵⁷³ Kronenbera (2009), 58.

⁵⁷⁴ Novo (1968), 96; Schorn (2011), 65.

Xenophon's theory of social education,⁵⁷⁵ to some extent, even the husband and housewife in this work also stand for king and queen in public life.

III. The Origin and Nature of Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*

In my view, the application of the experiences and theories in public education in construction of the *Oeconomicus* by Xenophon is not accidental. It is determined by the nature of classical Athenian family life and the character of his system of thought.

First of all, in the daily life of the Athenian upper class, the wife is the natural object of education for her husband. This fact is not only determined by the social concept on gender, but is also influenced by the age difference between the couple. In the *Oeconomicus*, Critobulus' wife was a small girl when she got married (Xen. *Oec.* 3.13); and Ischomachus' bride is only 15 years old (Xen. *Oec.* 7.5). Their knowledge and vision must be limited. According to the estimation of scholars who studied relevant inscriptions available systematically, in classical Athenian upper class, the average age for marriage of men is around 30 years old, while women generally get married at 14.⁵⁷⁶ In that case, it is necessary for a husband to teach his wife some skills in daily life, and to be responsible for her behaviour.⁵⁷⁷ And it is exactly an Athenian husband's ideal that his wife should be 'a young girl, quite untouched either physically or intellectually'⁵⁷⁸ when she gets married. Therefore, the relationship between husband and wife is very similar to that between teacher and student, or leader and follower. That fact provides a possibility for Xenophon to apply his experience and theory of social education into the domestic sphere.

What is more, the correspondence between the political and domestic spheres can be easily understood and accepted by Xenophon's readers in classical Athenian cultural context. As Roger Brock points out, 'in fifth-century Athenian usage, the

⁵⁷⁵ Novo (1968), 8.

⁵⁷⁶ Pomeroy (1994), 268.

⁵⁷⁷ Pomeroy (1994), 231.

⁵⁷⁸ Dillon (2004), 10.

idea of a domestic economy is almost exclusively developed in terms of the related ideas of politicians as servants of the Demos and of relations between the two.’⁵⁷⁹ This idea is fully expressed in Arisophanes’ *Knights*.⁵⁸⁰ In Plato’s works, the art of government and that of domestic management are usually correspondent.⁵⁸¹ Aristotle also reports that (though he criticises that view (Arist. *Pol.* 1252a17-18)) some people (perhaps including Plato and Xenophon) in his time believe that ‘the qualifications of a statesman, king, householder, and master are the same, and that they differ, not in kind, but only in the number of their subjects’ (Arist. *Pol.* 1252a9-11). Therefore, it must be also quite natural for Xenophon to follow cultural tradition and draw comparison between political government and domestic management.

Nevertheless, the character of Xenophon’s own thought plays a far more important role in forming his methodology in the *Oeconomicus*. Among classical writers, only Xenophon and Aristotle (in his *Politica*) noticed and discussed the role of domestic manager in its own right and in great detail. That is by no means accidental. In the traditional view of Athenian society, basic education, especially that in the domestic sphere, is usually carried out by women and servants. Generally speaking, Athenian common people admit the importance of primary education itself, but they lack sufficient respect for educators who carry it out. Demosthenes even mocked Aeschines by saying, ‘You taught letters; I attended school. You conducted initiations; I was initiated. You were a clerk; I a member of the Assembly: you a third-rate actor, I a spectator of the play. You used to be driven from the stage, while I hissed.’ (Dem. *De cor.* 265) Similar to clerks and actors, the social standing of teachers in classical Athens is low. And the status of *paidagogus*, the attendant of children for their education, must be more miserable. Images on vases and terracotta

⁵⁷⁹ Brock (2004), 248.

⁵⁸⁰ Brock (2004), 248.

⁵⁸¹ Pl. *Resp.* 600d; *Plt.* 258e-259c; *Prt.* 318e-319a; Brock (2004), 248.

often depict *paidagogus* as a bald foreigner with a shaggy beard and a stick,⁵⁸² who is likely to be a slave. Some contemporaries of Xenophon, such as Plato and Isocrates, emphasised the importance of good teachers of philosophy and rhetoric. But their interest in educators of ‘elementary affairs’, such as moral regulation, labour and other professional skills, is far less than Xenophon, though these qualities themselves are very important in Plato or Isocrates’ ideas. It seems that they would also take it for granted that only housewives, baby-sitters and pedagogues should be responsible for moral education of common people (except for those extraordinary ones who are suitable for philosophical and rhetorical education), as most contemporary Greek believe. However, according to Xenophon’s thought on social education, the roles played by the educator in every stage of the development of morality are all crucial (Xen. Cyr. 1.2.2-14); and an ideal educator of social morality should be the leader and organiser of the whole society as well (Lycurgus, Cyrus the Great, Agesilaus, Hiero, and so on). With his good behaviour, wise law, competent staff, proper reward and punishment, piety to gods, a good leader can improve the morality and spirit of the whole society, and impose his positive impact to every sphere in life.⁵⁸³ As a matter of fact, the emphasis on education and educational art can be seen in almost every work by Xenophon, including the *Oeconomicus*.⁵⁸⁴ In his eyes, as the educator and organiser in the private sphere, the person in charge of domestic affairs should also be respected and studied seriously.

What is more, unlike Plato and Aristotle, the methodology of Xenophon pays less attention to abstract philosophical terms, but focuses on the mode of management. This preference encourages him to break the borders among different spheres and construct his macroscopic, universal system of thought. Therefore, we can recognise almost identical theoretical modes in his *Hiero*, *Cyropaedia*, *Oeconomicus* and *Memorabilia*. As one of the pioneers in the study of domestic

⁵⁸² Christes (2000), 150.

⁵⁸³ Gray (2010), 267.

⁵⁸⁴ Pomeroy (1994), 267.

management, Xenophon might not have many former works for reference apart from some poems such as Hesiod's *Works and Days*. As a result, he applies the mode for social management and education summarised from the public sphere into domestic area, invented an influential genre of writing in Greek and Roman literature, and made a great contribution to the academic research of the private sphere of ancient Greek society.

In my opinion, the *Oeconomicus* is neither a historical record of the experience of Xenophon and his wife Philesia in family life, nor a thoroughly new achievement accomplished after the author abandoned his political career in frustration. Such suppositions are not quite suitable for a mercenary soldier and metic resident in Corinth who spent thirty-six years in exile.⁵⁸⁵ In essence, it is an attempt of Xenophon to extend his theoretical system from the public sphere to the private sphere after his theory of social education was established. Socrates and Ischomachus are both carriers of Xenophon's own thought on social education. In 1964, Frederick Beck comments in his *Greek Education: 450-350 B.C.* that 'For the student of Education Xenophon is an interesting but disappointing figure. On such questions as the subject-matter of Education or its philosophical basis he has practically nothing to contribute.'⁵⁸⁶ In his opinion, Xenophon's system of education is incomplete because he ignores cultural education entirely — 'no reading, no writing, no study of literature or mathematic',⁵⁸⁷ therefore 'the scope of his system leaves untouched whole areas of human interest and experience'.⁵⁸⁸ That might be quite unfair to Xenophon. As a matter of fact, Plato, Xenophon and Isocrates all lay great emphasis on the importance of cultural education, but in different ways. Plato devises the system and methods of cultural education in his philosophical works such as the *Republic* and the *Laws*; Isocrates puts rhetorical education into practice; and Xenophon composes works for the very aim of cultural education and moral

⁵⁸⁵ Delebecque (1957), 499.

⁵⁸⁶ Beck (1964), 244.

⁵⁸⁷ Beck (1964), 248.

⁵⁸⁸ Beck (1964), 253.

elevation. Along with the *Cyropaedia*, *Hiero*, *Spartan Constitution* and *Agésilas*, the *Oeconomicus* is another evidence of Xenophon's great effort of broadcasting his idea on social education among Greek intellectuals. And it is particularly noteworthy because it is also an attempt to transplant his experience and theory in public life into the domestic sphere. In Xenophon's belief, the positive influence of great leaders, such as Cyrus the Great, Agésilas and Lycurgus in public moral education, and the wise laws of Draco, Solon and Persians are also applicable in family life and domestic labours and he is confident that the knowledge can help everyone gain wealth, orderly life as well as happiness. This work has certain significant influences in the history of Greek and Roman thought.

First of all, the *Oeconomicus* takes the domestic sphere as the equivalent and extension of the public world, and therefore improves the status of family life and women who live in the household in Greek literature. His view is unique among Greek writers and especially differs from those of Hesiod, Greek philosophers and Attic dramatists.

In Hesiod's opinion, life in reality is miserable (Hes. *Op.* 174-175), and farming is a forced punishment on mortals from Zeus (Hes. *Op.* 42-105). He admonishes his brother that the purpose of work is to avoid more serious disasters (Hes. *Op.* 397-400). Generally speaking, other Greek writers' views on domestic labour are not so pessimistic, but almost all of them believe that family life is inferior to political, military and intellectual affairs. Pseudo-Aristotle's *Oeconomica* discusses four different economics, and asserts directly that private economic is the least noteworthy among them (Arist. [*Oec.*] 1345b13-1346a13). Aristotle also writes in the *Politica* that, 'the state is by nature clearly prior to the family and to the individual, since the whole is of necessity prior to the part.' (Arist. *Pol.* 1253a19-20) According to his logic, the part (family) cannot survive without the whole (state); therefore, it must be inferior and less important. In most works of the Attic dramatists, the responsibility of women is to be obedient to their husbands (Soph. *Aj.* 293; Eur. *Med.*

230-245), and their existence is trivial and even negative.⁵⁸⁹ Xenophon is familiar with that idea and even mentions through the mouth of Socrates the contempt of common Athenians for domestic labours (Xen. *Oec.* 4.2-3.). But his thought expressed in the *Oeconomicus* improves greatly the importance of the domestic sphere.⁵⁹⁰ According to Xenophon's view, both domestic and public works are indispensable, but the will of the gods entrusts the former to women and the latter to men (Xen. *Oec.* 7.22). Of course, women's life is still confined to home (Xen. *Oec.* 7.29-31). But the role they play becomes significant and indispensable.⁵⁹¹ The value of the good housewife is justly recognised. Their responsibility is no longer passive obedience. Their active part even requires the elementary ability of writing.⁵⁹² This picture is quite different from the one depicted in most Attic tragedies.⁵⁹³ Even if this kind of life is not historical or applicable at all, the spread of the *Oeconomicus* must still be positive for the improvement of women's image and status.

Of course, in a male-dominated Athenian society, the major function of the *Oeconomicus* is still to change the common contempt of men for domestic management and to advocate for the life of hard-working in the private sphere. Xenophon points out that property would be useless if people do not know how to manage it at all (Xen. *Oec.* 1.12). On the other hand, a wise house owner can easily make his life richer and happier. The *Oeconomicus* does not ask people to preserve wealth only, but encourage them to keep their property in the best condition and make the greatest increase of it by just and honourable means (Xen. *Oec.* 7.15). A bad master cannot stop his slaves from fleeing even if he keeps all of them in chains; while another expert in household management can easily make his servants hard-working without force (Xen. *Oec.* 3.4). Such wise house-owners are not rustic farmers in the traditional Greek concept, but someone sharing the nobility of good

⁵⁸⁹ Gomme (1925), 8; Willner (1982), 72-74 ; Seaford (1990), 77.

⁵⁹⁰ Pomeroy (1994), 217.

⁵⁹¹ Wiemer (2005), 427.

⁵⁹² Wiemer (2005), 432.

⁵⁹³ Scaife (1995), 232.

kings. They are as ‘good and honourable (καλός καγαθός)’ as Ischomachus,⁵⁹⁴ or as Socrates and his friends (Xen. *Symp.* 1). Due to the lack of relevant historical documents, we have no idea about whether Xenophon’s theory was valued or applied with any success in Athens or beyond. But the creation and dissemination of the *Oeconomicus* already proves Xenophon’s talent and the wide acceptance of the work in the Greek world.

After its birth, Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* was read and cited as a source of wisdom for more than two millennia.⁵⁹⁵ It created a new genre in Greek literature,⁵⁹⁶ whose tradition was followed by Pseudo-Aristotle (sometimes recognised as Theophrastus) and Philodemus,⁵⁹⁷ and also inspired later agricultural works and made great influence in the history of classical literature. According to Varro, there were already more than fifty works on agriculture in his time (Varro, *Rust.* 1.7-8). Cicero translated Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus* into Latin in his youth and made it famous among Roman intellectuals (Cic. *Off.* 2.87; Columella, *Rust.* 12, Praefatio 7; 12.2.6). Xenophon’s tradition of connecting the private and public spheres seems to illuminate some later writers. The use of bee imagery became a typical mark of later agricultural writings in Varro and Virgil’s works;⁵⁹⁸ Cato the elder argues in his *On Agriculture* that agricultural works are valuable because they offer exercise for the training of good soldiers (Cato, *Agr.* Praefatio 4); Aristotle also starts his *Politica* from discussing the roles of family members (Arist. *Pol.* 1253b1-3). These writing styles may be influenced by Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*.

Of course, the *Oeconomicus* does have its weakness if we take it as one piece of historical material on Athenian domestic life (as Pomeroy does in her commentary on the *Oeconomicus*) or even the record of Xenophon’s own experience in family life

⁵⁹⁴ Xen. *Oec.* 10.1; Bourriot (1995), 319.

⁵⁹⁵ Saller (2007), 87.

⁵⁹⁶ Waterfield (2004), 81.

⁵⁹⁷ Pomeroy (1994), 68.

⁵⁹⁸ Kronenbera (2009), 2-3.

(as J.K. Anderson believes in his monumental work on Xenophon's life,⁵⁹⁹ and the argument of L.R. Shero mentioned above). The main problem is that it is a work constructed by Xenophon by the application of experiences in the public spheres into the domestic sphere, whose real nature might be quite alien to the author himself. Nothing can ensure that it is historical or at least applicable in contemporary practice. From the view of social gender, the 'good housewife' in the *Oeconomicus* is a typical construction from men's viewpoint,⁶⁰⁰ and seems to be unreal and unconvincing. In fact, most of the later writers on house hold management discard Xenophon's method. The *Oeconomica* by pseudo-Aristotle negates Xenophon's basic approach in the opening part and argues that the difference between politics and household management is even larger than that between polis and house; furthermore, the constitutions of democracy and oligarchy do not exist in contemporary domestic life at all,⁶⁰¹ as a result the experience in public affairs is not totally applicable in the domestic sphere. Therefore, the analysis of the particular features of the *Oeconomicus* and the avoidance of over-interpretation of the materials on social history contained in this work are also necessary for us to study and utilise Xenophon's text properly.

⁵⁹⁹ Anderson (1974), 175.

⁶⁰⁰ Wiemer (2005), 424.

⁶⁰¹ Arist. [*Oec.*] 1343a1-5. Aristotle also to some extent questions this method Xenophon (and perhaps others) adopts, see Arist. *Pol.* 1252a8-18.

Conclusion

In modern scholarship until recent years, Xenophon was usually described as a mediocre, unoriginal and conservative author. His contribution to educational thought is often either totally ignored by modern emphasis on ‘cultural education’, which is carried out in the classroom, or severely oversimplified by confining his ‘educational works’ to his three manuals on physical training only through distorted interpretation of the term παιδεία in the extant corpus of Xenophon.

The aim of my thesis is of course not to make an apology for Xenophon, or to argue that we should follow his educational principles instead of modern ones. Nevertheless, I believe that as a prolific⁶⁰² and influential writer in antiquity, Xenophon and his thought on moral education deserve to be treated seriously in their own right. Therefore, in this thesis, I attempt to find out the objects, aims and means of παιδεία in Xenophon’s own context. The result shows that Xenophon actually uses the concept of παιδεία in its broad sense in his *Cyropaedia*, which covers all phases of one’s life and can be applied to anyone deserving to be educated; it should be carried out by an ideal political leader in public life and aim for ultimate happiness in the context of Socratic moral philosophy. Further, I discover that the same educational theory is repeated and supplemented systematically in Xenophon’s other writings, such as the *Spartan Constitution*, the *Hiero*, the *Anabasis* and the *Poroi*, which have little to do with education at first glance; and Xenophon also applies this theory in the literary composition of his *Agesilaus*, *Oeconomicus* and *Cynegeticus*, which respectively set up examples for biographies, domestic writings and practical manuals composed in later ages.

In that case, I would argue that Xenophon successfully established one type of theory of moral education in his extant writings. It is not as profound as those of Plato and Aristotle, but is expressed clearly and systematically in Xenophon’s elegant

⁶⁰² Gish and Ambler (2009), 182.

writing style. Xenophon's education should be based on a satisfactory, sometimes utopian constitution (Persia under the reign of Cyrus the Great (the *Cyropaedia*), Sparta regulated by law of Lycurgus (the *Spartan Constitution*), classical Athens governed by competent leaders (the *Poroi*)); it is carried out by an ideal leader full of piety, justice, wisdom and charisma (Cyrus the Great (the *Cyropaedia*), Lycurgus (the *Spartan Constitution*), Cyrus the Younger and Xenophon (the *Anabasis*), Agesilaus (the *Hellenica* and the *Agesilaus*) and Socrates (the *Memorabilia*)); the products of this kind of education are virtuous people living in obedience (the *Cyropaedia* and the *Spartan Constitution*), patriotism (the *Agesilaus* and the *Cynegeticus*), wealth (the *Poroi* and the *Oeconomicus*) and happiness (the *Hiero*); the leader should be willing to play his role well to the best of his ability because it is also beneficial for his own happiness (the *Hiero*), and he is allowed to use dirty tricks in his government as long as his ultimate aim is virtuous (the *Anabasis*, the *Agesilaus* and the *Cyropaedia*); such experience of public education can be introduced to domestic life as well (the *Oeconomicus*); and although the system of moral education cannot be maintained after the ideal leader's death (*Cyr.* 8.8 and *Lac.* 14), its positive influence can still be everlasting through the record of the hero's glorious deeds (the *Agesilaus*).

As the passages above show, Xenophon's theory of moral education is both original and innovative. He did get many ideas from Socrates' teaching; and perhaps (though this is much disputed) he also borrowed from Isocrates' *Evagoras*, Simonides' lost poems and Plato's works of similar titles (the *Symposium* and the *Apology*). However, Xenophon managed to integrate all these borrowed ideas and make them serve his own theory of moral education systematically. His tolerant and even positive attitude to the accumulation of wealth and use of dirty tricks in government is unique among all extant Greek thinkers; and his creation of prototypes of new literary genres by application of his educational theory is further evidence of his original talent.

Traditionally, critics often blame Xenophon's conservatism for his use of ancient examples, such as Cyrus the Great's Persia and Lycurgus' Sparta and his focus on aristocratic physical training. In my thesis, I try to clarify the truth by showing that Xenophon's educational plan aims to solve the moral crisis of his time, and his *Cyropaedia* and *Spartan Constitution* contain an innovative educational theory hidden in his description, which must be at least partly fictional and imaginary in itself, of the remote past, just like what Plato and Isocrates did in their immortal works.⁶⁰³ If we examine Xenophon's argument in the historical background of his age, we can see clearly that a lot of key features of his thought on moral education, for instance categorisation of virtues, pan-Hellenism, innovative understanding of the title καλὸς καὶγαθός,⁶⁰⁴ advocacy of strict social control, and the image of all-mighty heroes are closely connected with the new trends of philosophical and political development in his lifetime.⁶⁰⁵ And though Xenophon obviously belonged to the Athenian aristocratic class⁶⁰⁶ and wrote most of his works in exile, he still tends to judge individuals and constitutions according to their nature without much personal bias. He highly praised the poor citizen Socrates, the barbarian Cyrus the Younger, the private householder Ischomachus and his wife, ancient Persia and Sparta and frankly criticised luxurious Alcibiades, Greek mobs in the long march, the Thirty supported by Spartans, Persians and Spartans in his own time; and his only standard is whether they possess ἀρετή or not.⁶⁰⁷ In sum, in comparison to Aristotle, who represents the typical attitude to Greek mass-elite relations among ancient aristocratic writers⁶⁰⁸ and suggests that even the 'notables' should be further divided

⁶⁰³ Rebenich (1998), 32.

⁶⁰⁴ Bourriot (1995), 351.

⁶⁰⁵ For instance, Xenophon's contemporary writer, Isocrates, also emphasise similar moral virtues and good behaviours, for example law-abiding (*To Demonicus*, 16), self-control (*To Demonicus*, 17), rewarding friends (*To Demonicus*, 26), piety (*To Nicocles*, 20); and Isocrates also points out the importance of moral exemplification of a ruler to his subjects (*To Nicocles*, 31), though he does not explain this view as systematically as Xenophon does in his corpus.

⁶⁰⁶ Roberts (1994), 75.

⁶⁰⁷ In Xenophon's context, the meaning of ἀρετή is mixed. It incorporates courage and body strength, which fits the common usage of this word in ancient daily life. But in most cases, Xenophon's use of ἀρετή has a clear moral and philosophical sense, which perhaps shows the influence of Socrates on himself.

⁶⁰⁸ Ober (1989), 11.

according to their ‘wealth, birth, excellence, education, and similar differences’ (Arist. *Pol.* 1291b28-29), Xenophon tends to value all kinds of people simply by their moral characters and behaviour in real life. As John M. Dillon points out, in Xenophon’s *Oeconomicus*, even ‘basic slaves’ can ‘respond satisfactorily to humane treatment, and all sorts of incentive’;⁶⁰⁹ and therefore ‘are capable of a high degree of moral excellence’.⁶¹⁰ Furthermore, in his context, most moral concepts, for example ‘la logique de la charis’ which Vincent Azoulay thoroughly studies are universally applicable among all nations⁶¹¹ and under all kinds of constitutions.⁶¹²

Nevertheless, in the study of Xenophon, we should not ignore the fact that his theory also contains certain weakness. First of all, in comparison to Plato and Aristotle, Xenophon’s understanding of Socratic philosophy is generally superficial, which limits the theoretical height he can achieve. For his educational theory, the ultimate aim, εὐδαιμονία, is colourfully depicted in the *Cyropaedia* and the *Hiero*, but is never theoretically defined and clarified as in Plato or Aristotle. In the *Hiero*, happiness, the object of the discussion between Simonides and Hiero, is sometimes described as something similar to εὐδαιμονία in Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, but in other cases is simply equal to sensual pleasure. This confusing treatment would cause Xenophon’s readers to wonder whether he was writing for serious philosophical study or for leisurely entertainment, and whether he fully understood the subject he was treating at all. In the second place, the moral standard Xenophon used in his extant works actually comes from two sources, namely Socrates’ ethical teaching and Xenophon’s personal experience as a general. The unnatural mixture of the two very different, occasionally incompatible elements creates Xenophon’s inconsistent attitude towards the ‘dark side’ of leadership. Sometimes the contradiction can be too obvious to be justified, and must be taken as evidence of occasional confusion in Xenophon’s moral system. Thirdly, Xenophon’s design, like

⁶⁰⁹ Dillon (2004), 10.

⁶¹⁰ Dillon (2004), 10.

⁶¹¹ Azoulay (2004c), 46.

⁶¹² Azoulay (2004c), 76.

those of almost all other great thinkers in the ancient world, is in essence utopian and not practical. It is almost impossible to find such an ideal political leader as Xenophon described in any country and any age to carry out his educational plan; his lure, the personal happiness of the leader himself as the result of his labour, is not persuasive enough; and it is also very difficult to distinguish his ideal leaders using dirty tricks from crafty politicians who can always find good excuses to justify their crimes in real world.⁶¹³

In spite of these shortcomings, Xenophon's system of moral education remains valuable due to its uniqueness. It is produced by a man of the world, who had travelled to the Persian Empire and used to live in Athens, Sparta, Elis and Corinth.⁶¹⁴ It is highly relevant to politics and is explained by a professional soldier and a man of action, who offers for us a unique perspective different from that of philosophical theorists.⁶¹⁵ In that sense, the study of Xenophon's thought on the moral education is a good approach for us to broaden our vision in the research of the classical Greek culture.

In any case, the influence of Xenophon's educational theory of later generations is undeniable. According to Cicero's report, Scipio Africanus always took Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* with him and tried to learn the righteous art of government from it (Cic. *QFr.* 1.1.23); Xenophon's tradition of admonishing the monarch 'for his own good' in his *Hiero* was followed by many writers in the Roman Empire, the Middle Ages as well as the modern world down to Carl von Clausewitz, the author of *Vom Kriege*; and his tolerant attitude to the dark side of leadership was also followed and developed by Niccolò Machiavelli, a scholar of Xenophon and the founding father of modern politics; some modern scholars believe that Adam Smith's idea

⁶¹³ Nevertheless, after all, the tension between ideal and reality in Xenophon's corpus is not as severe as that in Plato. Xenophon is a man of action; and his plan of social reform at least attempts to be practical. Some of his advice is taken from the art of government of Agesilaus, Cyrus the Younger and Xenophon himself; while some is summarised from historical experience and Xenophon's observation of his time (see Part 1, Chapter 1 of this thesis). In that sense, the corpus of Xenophon provides for us a realistic doctrine of moral education proposed from a very particular perspect.

⁶¹⁴ Ferguson (1975), 56.

⁶¹⁵ Ferguson (1975), 56.

about the division of labour also comes from his reading of Xenophon's depiction of the ideal organisation of society in his *Cyr.* 8.2.5-6.⁶¹⁶ In the area of literary composition, the impact of Xenophon on later writers is immense. In the early Roman Empire, especially during the so-called Second Sophistic movement, Xenophon's works were set up as a great example of writing style by authors such like Plutarch (who cites or refers to Xenophon by name thirty-one times in the *Moralia*, and fourteen times in the *Parallel Lives*),⁶¹⁷ Arrian, Dio Chrysostom and Pseudo-Aristides.⁶¹⁸ As a result, the mark of Xenophon's moralism and educational intention is clearly shown in Dio Chrysostom's four orations on kingship, Plutarch's biographies (Plut. *Vit. Per.* 2.2-3) and Columella's *Res Rustica* (Columella, *Rust.* 12. Praefatio.1.7). And his moral tendency in his historical works, together with that of Herodotus and other early historians, also has great influence (sometimes negative) on Theopompus and Ephorus;⁶¹⁹ and this tradition was in turn inherited by many Hellenistic and Roman historians.⁶²⁰ Therefore, Xenophon's importance for moral-didactic tradition of historiography deserves serious treatment.⁶²¹ No matter how we should evaluate the influence of Xenophon's educational idea, the existence of the phenomenon is in itself noteworthy and proves the importance of Xenophon's theory of moral education in history of thought.

⁶¹⁶ Figueira (2012), 683.

⁶¹⁷ Stadter (2012), 44.

⁶¹⁸ Stadter (2012), 43-44.

⁶¹⁹ Pownall (2004), 176.

⁶²⁰ Pownall (2004), 181-182.

⁶²¹ For this subject, Lisa Irene Hau summarises well in her recent paper as follows: 'The difference between Xenophon's approach and that of Polybius and Diodorus is that while the classical historiographer is notorious for leaving any didactic conclusions entirely up to the reader, thus often imbuing his work with a moral ambiguity which keeps modern scholars arguing about even his basic messages, the two Hellenistic historiographers usually comment unambiguously on the narrated situations and set out the moral explicitly for the reader. Thus, human inability to handle great good fortune becomes a major and explicit didactic theme. This theme was presented in Greek historiography from the very beginning, but it was Xenophon's approach — his interest in success-induced contempt for the enemy and consequent disaster, his insistence on the immorality of arrogant pride even in non-military situations, and even his use of *phronēma*, *mega phronein* and *kataphronēsis* — that was picked up by the Hellenistic historiographers and carried on in their massive works. Thus, the least famous of the three famous classical historians made his permanent mark on the moral-didactic tradition of historiography.' See Hau (2012), 608-609.

Bibliography

- Aalders, G. (1953), 'Date and Intention of Xenophon's "Hiero"', *Mnemosyne* 6, 208-215.
- L'Allier, L. (2012), 'Why Did Xenophon Write the Last Chapter of the *Cynegeticus*?', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 477-497.
- Anderson, J. (1974), *Xenophon*, London.
- Austin, M. and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1977), *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: An Introduction*, Austin, M., tr., London.
- Azoulay, V. (2004a), 'Exchange as Entrapment: Mercenary Xenophon?', in Lane Fox, R. ed., *The Long March, Xenophon and the Ten Thousand*, New Haven & London, 289-304.
- Azoulay, V. (2004b), 'The Medo-Persian Ceremonial: Xenophon, Cyrus and the King's Body', in Tuplin, C., ed., *Xenophon and His World, Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999*, Stuttgart, 147-173.
- Azoulay, V. (2004c), *Xénophon et les grâces du pouvoir: de la charis au charisme*, Paris.
- Badian, E. (2004), 'Xenophon the Athenian', in Tuplin, C., ed., *Xenophon and His World, Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999*, Stuttgart, 33-53.
- Balme, M. (1984), 'Attitudes to Work and Leisure in Ancient Greece', *Greece & Rome* 31, 140-152.
- Bandini, M. and Dorion, L. (2000), eds./trs., *Xénophon, Mémorables, Tome I, Livre I*, Paris.
- Bandini, M. and Dorion, L. (2011a), eds./trs., *Xénophon, Mémorables, Tome II, 1^{re} Partie, Livre II-III*, Paris.
- Bandini, M. and Dorion, L. (2011b), eds./trs., *Xénophon, Mémorables, Tome II, 2^e Partie, Livre IV*, Paris.
- Baragwanath, E. (2012), 'The Wonder of Freedom: Xenophon on Slavery', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 631-663.
- Beck, F. (1964), *Greek Education, 450-350 B.C.*, London.
- Bordes, J. (1982), *Politeia dans la pensée grecque jusqu'à Aristote*, Paris.
- Bourriot, F. (1995), *Kalos Kagathos – Kalokagathia*, Hildesheim & Zürich & New York.

- Bowen, A. (1998), ed./tr., *Xenophon: Symposium*, Warminster.
- Bowersock, G. (1998), 'Vita Caesarum: Remembering and Forgetting the Past', in Ehlers, W.W., ed., *La Biographie antique*, Genève, 193-216.
- Bradley, P. (1999), Review: Sarah B. Pomeroy: *Xenophon: Oeconomicus: A Social and Historical Commentary*, Oxford, Oxford at Clarendon Press, 1994, *The Classical World* 92, 477-478.
- Breitenbach, H. (1967), 'Xenophon von Athen', in Ziegler, K., ed., *Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol.9A.2, Stuttgart, 1568-2051
- Brickhouse, T. and Smith, N. (1989), *Socrates on Trial*, Oxford.
- Brock, R. (2004), 'Xenophon's Political Imagery', in Tuplin, C., ed., *Xenophon and His World*, Stuttgart, 247-258.
- Brock, R. (2013), *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle*, London & New Delhi & New York & Sydney.
- Brownson, C. (1921), ed./tr., *Xenophon: Hellenica*, Books VI-VII; *Anabasis*, Books I-III, London & New York,.
- Bryant, J. (1996), *Moral Codes and Social Structure in Ancient Greece, A Sociology of Greek Ethics from Homer to the Epicureans and Stoics*, Albany.
- Buckler, J. (1980), *The Theban Hegemony, 371-362 B.C.*, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London.
- Bury, J. and Meiggs, R. (1975), *A History of Greece to the Death of Alexander the Great*, fourth edition revised, London.
- Cairns, D. (2010), *Bacchylides: Five Epinician Odes*, Cambridge.
- Carlier, P. (2010), 'The Idea of Imperial Monarchy in Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*', in Gray, V., ed., *Xenophon*, Oxford, 327-366.
- Cartledge, P. (1987), *Agésilaios and the Crisis of Sparta*, London.
- Cawkwell, G. (1973), 'The Foundation of the Second Athenian Confederacy', *The Classical Quarterly* 23, 47-60.
- Cawkwell, G. (1979), Review: Xenophon's *Poroi*, Un commentaire historique des *Poroi* de Xénophon by Philippe Gauthier, *The Classical Review* 29 (New Series), 17-19.

- Chrimes, K., (1948), *The Respublica Lacedaemoniorum Ascribed to Xenophon*, Manchester.
- Christ, M. (2006), *The Bad Citizen in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
- Christensen, P. (2006), 'Xenophon's "Cyropaedia" and Military Reform in Sparta', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126, 47-65.
- Christes, J. (2000), 'Paidagogos', in Cancik, H., Schneider, H., eds., *Der neue Pauly, Enzyklopädie der Antike* 9, Stuttgart & Weimar, 150.
- Cox, P. (1983), *Biography in Late Antiquity: A Quest for the Holy Man*, Berkeley & London.
- De Ste. Croix, G. (1972), *The Origin of the Peloponnesian War*, London.
- Danzig, G. (2003), 'Why Socrates Was Not a Farmer: Xenophon's *Oeconomicus* as a Philosophical Dialogue', *Greece & Rome* 50, 57-76.
- Danzig, G. (2009), 'Big Boys and Little Boys', in Gish, D. and Ambler, W., eds., *The Political Thought of Xenophon, Polis: The Journal of Ancient Greek Political Thought* 26, 271-295.
- Danzig, G. (2012), 'The Best of the Achaemenids: Benevolence, Self-interest and the 'Ironic' Reading of *Cyropaedia*', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 499-539.
- Davies, J. (1993), *Democracy and Classical Greece*, second edition, London.
- Davis, M. (1965), 'How Many Agronomoi Are There in Plato's *Laws*?', *Classical Philology* 60, 28-29.
- Delatte, A. (1933), *Le troisième livre des souvenirs Socratiques de Xénophon*, Paris.
- Delebecque, É. (1957), *Essai sur la vie de Xénophon*, Paris.
- Dihle, A. (1956), *Studien zur griechischen Biographie*, Göttingen.
- Dihle, A. (1989), Malzahn, M., tr., *Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire, From Augustus to Justinian*, London & New York.
- Dihle, A. (1994), Krojzl, C., tr., *A History of Greek Literature*, London & New York.
- Dillery, J. (1993), 'Xenophon's *Poroi* and Athenian Imperialism', *Historia: Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte* 42, 1-11.
- Dillery, J. (1995), *Xenophon and the History of His Times*, London.
- Dillon, J. (2004), *Salt & Olives, Morality and Custom in Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh.

- Dorion, L. (2009), 'Xenophon's Socrates', Menn, S., tr., in Ahbel-Rappe, S. and Kamtekar, R., eds., *A Companion to Socrates*, Chichester, 93-109.
- Dover, K. (1974), *Greek Popular Morality in the Time of Plato and Aristotle*, Oxford.
- Dreher, M. (2004), 'Der Prozeß gegen Xenophon', in Tuplin, C., ed., *Xenophon and His World, Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999*, Stuttgart, 54-70.
- Due, B. (1989), *The Cyropaedia, Xenophon's Aims and Methods*, Aarhus & Copenhagen.
- Duffy, B. (1983), 'The Platonic Functions of Epideictic Rhetoric', *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 16, 79-93.
- Farber, J. (1979), 'The Cyropaedia and Hellenistic Kingship', *The American Journal of Philology* 100, 497-514.
- Farenga, V. (2006), *Citizen and Self in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge.
- Fearn, D. (2002), *Bacchylides, Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition*, Oxford.
- Ferguson, J. (1975), *Utopias of the Classical World*, London.
- Ferrario, S. (2012), 'Historical Agency and Self-awareness in Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Anabasis*', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 341-376.
- Figueira, T. (2012), 'Economic Thought and Economic Fact in the Works of Xenophon', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 665-681.
- Finley, M. (1999), *The Ancient Economy*, updated second edition, Berkeley & Los Angeles & London.
- Friend, J. (2009), *The Athenian Ephebeia in the Lycurgan Period: 334/3-322/1 B.C.*, PhD Thesis, University of Texas at Austin.
- Fuks, A. (1984), *Social Conflict in Ancient Greece*, Leiden.
- Gauthier, P. (2010), 'Xenophon's Programme in the *Poroi*', in Gray, V. J., ed., *Xenophon*, Oxford, 113-136.
- Gauthier, P. (1976), *Un commentaire historique des Poroi de Xénophon*, Genève & Paris.
- Geiger, J. (1985), *Cornelius Nepos and Ancient Political Biography*, Stuttgart.

- Gera, D. (1993), *Xenophon's Cyropaedia, Style, Genre and Literary Technique*, Oxford.
- Gish, D. (2009), 'Spartan Justice: The Conspiracy of Kingdom in Xenophon's *Hellenika*', in Gish, D. and Ambler, W., eds., *The Political Thought of Xenophon, Polis: The Journal of Ancient Greek Political Thought* 26, 339-369.
- Gish, D. and Ambler, W. (2009), 'The Political Thought of Xenophon', in Gish, D. and Ambler, W., eds., *The Political Thought of Xenophon, Polis: The Journal of Ancient Greek Political Thought* 26, 181-184.
- Gomme, A. (1925), 'The Position of Women in Athens in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries', *Classical Philology* 20, 1-25.
- Grant, M. (1970), *The Ancient Historians*, London.
- Gray, V. (1986), 'Xenophon's *Hiero* and the Meeting of the Wise Man and Tyrant in Greek Literature', *The Classical Quarterly* 36, 115-123.
- Gray, V. (1989a), *The Character of Xenophon's Hellenica*, London.
- Gray, V. (1989b), 'Xenophon's Defence of Socrates: The Rhetorical Background to the Socratic Problem', *The Classical Quarterly, New Series*, 39, 136-140.
- Gray, V. (1991), 'Continuous History and Xenophon, *Hellenica* 1-2.3.10', *The American Journal of Philology* 112, 201-228.
- Gray, V. (2007), *Xenophon on Government*, Cambridge.
- Gray, V. (2010), 'Xenophon', in Gagarin, M., Fantham, E., eds., *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome* 7, Oxford, 266-271.
- Gray, V. (2011), *Xenophon's Mirror of Princes, Reading the Reflections*, Oxford.
- Guthrie, W. (1969), *A History of Greek Philosophy*, Vol. III, Cambridge.
- Hägg, T. and Rousseau, P. (2002), eds., *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*, Berkeley & London.
- Hamilton, C. (1997), 'Sparta', in Tritle, L.A., ed., *The Greek World in the Fourth Century, from the Fall of the Athenian Empire to the Successors of Alexander*, London & New York, 41-65.
- Hammond, N. (1959), *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Hansen, M. (1991), *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes, Structure, Principles*

and Ideology, Crook, J., tr., Oxford.

Harman, R. (2012), 'A Spectacle of Greekness: Panhellenism and the Visual in Xenophon's *Agesilaus*', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 427-453.

Harrison, E. (1940), 'Jaeger's *Paideia* in English', *The Classical Review* 54, 32-33.

Hatzfeld, J. (1951), *Alcibiade, Étude sur l'histoire d'Athènes à la fin du Ve siècle*, Paris.

Hau, L. (2007), *The Changeability of Fortune in Greek Historiography – Moralizing Themes and Techniques from Herodotos to Diodoros of Sicily*, PhD dissertation, London.

Hau, L. (2012), 'Does Pride Go before a Fall? Xenophon on Arrogant Pride', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 591-610.

Henry, W. (1967), *Greek Historical Writing, A Historiographical Essay Based on Xenophon's Hellenica*, Chicago.

Herman, G. (2006), *Morality and Behaviour in Democratic Athens, A Social History*, Cambridge.

Hesk, J. (2000), *Deception and Democracy in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.

Higgins, W. (1973), *Xenophon the Athenian, The Problem of the Individual and the Society of the Polis*, Albany.

Hirsch, S. (1985), *The Friendship of the Barbarians, Xenophon and the Persian Empire*, Hanover & London.

Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C. (2012), eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden.

Holm, A. (1896), *The History of Greece from Its Commencement to the Close of the Independence of the Greek Nation*, Clarke, F, tr., London & New York.

Hornblower, S. (1994), 'Sources and Their Uses', in Lewis, D.M., Boardman, J. Ostwald, M., eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History*, second edition, Vol. VI, Cambridge, 1-23.

Hornblower, S. (2000), 'The *Old Oligarch* (Pseudo-Xenophon's *Athenaion Politeia*) and Thucydides, A Fourth-Century Date for the *Old Oligarch*?' in Flensted-Jensen, P., Hansen, M., Nielsen, T., Rubinstein, L., eds., *Polis and Politics*, 363-384.

Hornblower, S. (2004a), 'This was Decided' (edoxe tauta), in Fox, R., *The Long March*,

Xenophon and the Ten Thousand, New Haven & London, 243-263.

Hornblower, S. (2004b), *Thucydides and Pindar: Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry*, Oxford.

Jaeger, W. (1945), Hignet, G., tr., *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, Vol. III, *The Conflict of Cultural Ideas in the Age of Plato*, Oxford.

Jaeger, W. (1954), Hignet, G., tr., *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, Vol. I, *Archaic Greece, the Mind of Athens*, Oxford.

Jaeger, W. (1957), Hignet, G., tr., *Paideia: the Ideals of Greek Culture*, Vol. II, *In Search of the Divine Centre*, Oxford.

Jansen, J. (2007), *After Empire: Xenophon's Poroi and the Reorientation of Athens' Political Economy*, PhD dissertation, Austin.

Johnson, D. (2005), 'Persians as Centaurs in Xenophon's "Cyropaedia"', *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 135, 177-207.

Joshel, S. and Murnaghan, S. (1998), eds., *Women and Slaves in Greco-Roman Culture*, London & New York.

Kagan, D. (1987), *The Fall of the Athenian Empire*, Ithaca & London.

Kojève, A. (1963a), 'Tyranny and Wisdom', in Strauss, L., ed., *On Tyranny*, London, 143-188.

Kojève, A. (1963b), 'Restatement on Xenophon's Hiero', in Strauss, L., ed., *On Tyranny*, London, 189-226.

Krentz, P. (2000), 'Deception in Archaic and Classical Greek Warfare', in Wees, H., ed., *War and Violence in Ancient Greece*, London, 167-200.

Kronenbera, L. (2009), *Allegories of Farming from Greece and Rome*, Cambridge.

Kurke, L. (1991). *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy*, Ithaca & London.

Lauxtermann, M. (1998), 'What is an Epideictic Epigram?', in *Mnemosyne* 51, 525-537.

Leo, F. (1901), *Die Griechisch-Römische Biographie nach ihrer literarischen Form*, Leipzig.

Lesky, A. (1966), Willis, J., Heer, C., trs, *A History of Greek Literature*, London.

Liddell, H. and Scott, R. (1996), *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford.

- Liddel, P. (2007), *Civic Obligation and Individual Liberty in Ancient Athens*, Oxford.
- Lipka, M. (2002), ed./tr., Xenophon: *Spartan Constitution*, Introduction, Text and Commentary Berlin & New York.
- Lorch, B. (2010), 'Xenophon's Socrates on Political Ambition and Political Philosophy', *The Review of Politics*, 72, 189-211.
- Lowe, N. (2007), 'Epinikian Eidography', in Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C., eds., *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals: from Archaic Greece to the Roman Empire*, 167-176.
- Luccioni, J. (1947), *Les idées politiques et sociales de Xénophon*, Paris.
- Luccioni, J. (1953), *Xénophon et le Socratisme*, Paris.
- Ma, J. (2010), 'You Can't Go Home Again: Displacement and Identity in Xenophon's *Anabasis*', in Gray, V., ed., *Xenophon*, Oxford, 502-519.
- De Marcellus, H. (1994), *The Origins and Nature of the Attic Ephebeia to 200 B.C.*, PhD Thesis, Oxford University.
- Marchant, E. (1923), ed./tr., *Xenophon : Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*, London & Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Marchant, E. (1925), ed./tr., *Xenophon : Scripta Minora*, London & Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Marincola, J. (1997), *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*, Cambridge.
- Marrou, H. (1948), *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'Antiquité*, Paris.
- Marschall, T. (1928), *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons*, München.
- McNamara, C. (2009), 'Socratic Politics in Xenophon's *Memorabilia*', in Gish, D. and Ambler, W., eds., *The Political Thought of Xenophon, Polis: The Journal of Ancient Greek Political Thought* 26, 2009, 223-245.
- Meiggs, R. (1972), *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford.
- Members of the Illinois Greek Club (1948), eds./trs., *Aeneas Tacticus, Asclepiodotus, Onasander: Works*, London & Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Michelini, A. (2003), 'Plato's Socratic Mask', in Michelini, A., ed., *Plato as Author*, Leiden & Boston, 45-65.
- Michell, H. (1957), *The Economics of Ancient Greece*, second edition, Cambridge.

- Millender, E. (2012), 'Spartan "Friendship" and Xenophon's Crafting of the *Anabasis*', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 377-425.
- Miller, W. (1914a), ed./tr., *Xenophon: Cyropaedia*, Books I -IV, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London.
- Miller, W. (1914b), ed./tr., *Xenophon: Cyropaedia*, Books V-VIII, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London.
- Millett, P. (1989), 'Patronage and Its Avoidance in Classical Athens', in Wallace-Hadrill, A., ed., *Patronage in Ancient Society*, London & New York, 15-47.
- Möller, A. (2007), 'Classical Greece: Distribution', in Scheidel, W., Morris, I., Saller, R., eds., *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*, Cambridge, 362-384.
- Momigliano, A. (1971), *The Development of Greek Biography*, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Momigliano, A. (2001), 'The Historians of the Classical World and their Audiences', in Nagy, G., ed., *Greek Literature 5, Greek Literature in the Classical Period: the Prose of Historiography and Oratory*, New York & London, 25-40.
- Morrison, D. (2010), 'Xenophon's Socrates as Teacher', in Gray, V.J. (2010), ed., *Xenophon*, Oxford, 195-227.
- Munson, R. (2001), *Ananke* in Herodotus, *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 121, 30-50.
- Nadon, C. (1996), 'From Republic to Empire: Political Revolution and the Common Good in Xenophon's *Education of Cyrus*', *The American Political Science Review* 90, 361-374.
- Nadon, C. (2001), *Xenophon's Prince: Republic and Empire in the Cyropaedia*, Los Angeles & London.
- Newell, W. (1983), 'Tyranny and the Science of Ruling in Xenophon's "*Education of Cyrus*"', *The Journal of Politics* 45, 889-906.
- Newell, W. (1988), 'Machiavelli and Xenophon on Princely Rule: A Double-Edged Encounter', *The Journal of Politics* 50, 108-130.
- Novo, S. (1968), *Economia ed etica nell'Economico di Senofonte*, Torino.
- Ober, J. (1989), *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens, Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the*

People, Princeton.

Ober, J. (2008), *Democracy and Knowledge, Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens*, Princeton & Oxford.

Oost, S. (1978), 'Xenophon's Attitude towards Women', *The Classical World* 71, 225-236.

Ostwald, M. (1969), *Nomos and The Beginnings of the Athenian Democracy*, Oxford.

Pangle, T. (1985), 'The Political Defence of Socratic Philosophy: A Study of Xenophon's *Apology of Socrates to the Jury*', *Polity*, 18, 98-114.

Park, C. (1983), 'At Home in History: Werner Jaeger's *Paideia*', *The American Scholar*, 52, 378-385.

Parker, R. (2004), 'One Man's Piety: The Religious Dimension of the *Anabasis*', in Lane Fox, R. ed., *The Long March, Xenophon and the Ten Thousand*, New Haven & London, 131-153.

Pearson, L. (1942), *The Local Historians of Attica*, Philadelphia.

Péridis, C. (1962), *Histoire de l'architecture Attique des origines à 31 avant Jésus-Christ*, Paris.

Pelling, C. (2006), 'Educating Croesus: Talking and Learning in Herodotus' Lydian *Logos*', *Classical Antiquity* 25, 141-177.

Poltera, O. (2008), *Simonides lyricus, Testimonia und Fragmente : Einleitung, kritische Ausgabe, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Basil.

Pomeroy, S. (1994), ed./tr., Xenophon: *Oeconomicus*, Oxford.

Pomeroy, S. (2010), 'Slavery in the Greek Domestic Economy in the Light of Xenophon's *Oeconomicus*', in Gray, V. (2010), ed., *Xenophon*, Oxford, 31-40.

Pownall, F. (1998), 'Condemnation of the Impious in Xenophon's *Hellenica*', *The Harvard Theological Review* 91, 251-277.

Pownall, F. (2004), *Lessons From the Past: The Moral Use of History in Fourth-Century Prose*, Ann Arbor.

Pritchett, W. (1971), *Ancient Greek Military Practices*, Part I, Berkeley & Los Angeles & London.

Pucci, P. (2007), *Inno alle Muse*, Pisa & Roma.

Rebenich, S. (1998), ed./tr., Xenophon: *Die Verfassung der Spartaner*, Darmstadt.

- Reinmuth, O. (1971), *The Ephebic Inscriptions of the Fourth Century B.C.*, Leiden.
- Reisert, J. (2009), 'Ambition and Corruption in Xenophon's *Education of Cyrus*', in Gish, D. and Ambler, W., eds., *The Political Thought of Xenophon, Polis: The Journal of Ancient Greek Political Thought* 26, 296-315.
- Rhodes, P. and Osborne, R. (2003), eds., *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404-323 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Rhodes, P. (2006), *A History of the Classical Greek World, 478-323 B.C.*, Malden & Oxford & Carlton.
- Rhodes, P. (2011), *Alcibiades*, Barnsley.
- Riedinger, J. (1991), *Étude sur les Helléniques, Xénophon et l'histoire*, Paris.
- Roberts, J. (1994), *Athens on Trial: The Anti-democratic Tradition in Western Thought*, Princeton.
- Roscalla, F. (2004), 'Kalokagathia e Kaloi Kagathoi in Senofonte', in Tuplin, C. (2004), ed., *Xenophon and His World*, Stuttgart, 115-124.
- Rosati, G. (2009), The Latin Reception of Hesiod, in Montanari, F., Rengakos, A. and Tsagalis, C., eds., *Brill's Companion to Hesiod*, Leiden & Boston, 343-374.
- Russell, B. (1946), *A History of Western Philosophy*, London.
- Russell, D. (1973), *Plutarch*, London.
- Sage, P. (1995), 'Dying in Style: Xenophon's Ideal Leader and the End of the "Cyropaedia"', *The Classical Journal* 90, 161-174.
- Saller, R. (2007), 'Household and Gender', in Scheidel, W., Morris, I. and Saller, R., eds., *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*, Cambridge, 87-112.
- De Sanctis, G. (1951), *Studi di storia della storiografia greca*, Florence.
- Sandridge, N. (2012), *Loving Humanity, Learning, and Being Honored: The Foundations of Leadership in Xenophon's Education of Cyrus*, Cambridge, Massachusetts & London.
- Scaife, R. (1995), 'Ritual and Persuasion in the House of Ischomachus', *The Classical Journal* 90, 225-232.
- Schachermeyr, F. (1960), *Griechische Geschichte mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der geistesgeschichtlichen und kulturmorphologischen Zusammenhänge*, Stuttgart.

- Schade, G. (2006), 'Die Oden von Pindar und Bakchylides auf Hieron', *Hermes* 134, 373-378.
- Scheidel, W., Morris, I. and Saller, R. (2007), eds., *The Cambridge Economic History of the Greco-Roman World*, Cambridge.
- Schorn, S. (2011), 'Xenophons *Poroi* als philosophische Schrift', *Historia* 60, 65-93.
- Schürumpf, E. (2002), 'Xenophon aus Athen', in Cancik, H. and Schneider, H., eds., *Der neue Pauly*, Band 12/2, Stuttgart & Weimar, 633-642.
- Seaford, R. (1990), 'The Imprisonment of Women in Greek Tragedy', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 110, 76-90.
- Seager, R. (2001), 'Xenophon and Athenian Democratic Ideology', *The Classical Quarterly* 51, 385-397.
- Severyns, A. (1933), *Bacchylide, Essai biographique*, Liège & Paris.
- Sevieri, R. (2004), 'The Imperfect Hero: Xenophon's *Hiero* as the (Self-) Taming of a Tyrant', in Tuplin, C. (ed.), *Xenophon and His World, Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999*, Stuttgart, 277-288.
- Shero, L. (1932), 'Xenophon's Portrait of a Young Wife', *The Classical Weekly* 26, 17-21.
- Shipley, D. (1997), *A Commentary on Plutarch's Life of Agesilaos*, Oxford.
- Siewert, P. (1977), 'The Ephebic Oath in Fifth-Century Athens', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97, 102-111.
- Simeterre, R. (1938), *Le théorie Socratique de la Vertu-Science selon les Mémoires de Xénophon*, Paris.
- Skemp, J. (1967), *The Theory of Motion in Plato's Later Dialogues*, enlarged edition, Amsterdam.
- Sordi, M. (2004), 'Senofonte e la Sicilia', in Tuplin, C., ed., *Xenophon and His World, Papers from a Conference Held in Liverpool in July 1999*, Stuttgart, 71-78.
- Soulis, E. (1972), *Xenophon and Thucydides*, PhD dissertation, Athens.
- Stadter, P. (1992), ed., *Plutarch and the Historical Tradition*, London & New York.
- Stadter, P. (2012), "'Staying up Late": Plutarch's Reading of Xenophon', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 43-62.

- Strauss, L. (1963), *On Tyranny*, revised and enlarged, New York.
- Stuart, D. (1928), *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography*, Berkeley.
- Stylianou, P. (1998), *A Historical Commentary on Diodorus Siculus Book 15*, Oxford.
- Tamiolaki, M. (2012), 'Virtue and Leadership in Xenophon: Ideal Leaders or Ideal Losers?', in Hobden, F. and Tuplin, C., eds., *Xenophon: Ethical Principles and Historical Enquiry*, Leiden, 563-589.
- Tatum, J. (1989), *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On the Education of Cyrus*, Princeton.
- Too, Y. (1995), Review: *Oeconomicus*, *The Classical Review* 45, 246-248.
- Tuplin, C. (1994), 'Xenophon, Sparta and the *Cyropaedia*', in Powell, A. and Hodkinson, S., eds., *The Shadow of Sparta*, London & New York, 127-181.
- Tuplin, C. (2003), 'Xenophon', in Hornblower, S. and Spawforth, A. eds., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, third edition revised, Oxford, 1628-1631.
- Tuplin, C. (2004), 'Xenophon, Artemis and Scyllus', in Figueira, T., ed., *Spartan Society*, Swansea.
- Villard, L. (2005), 'Xénophon d'Athènes', in Leclant, J., ed., *Dictionnaire de l'Antiquité*, Paris, 2269-2271.
- Waterfield, R. (2004), 'Xenophon's Socratic Mission', in Tuplin, C. (2004), ed., *Xenophon and His World*, Stuttgart, 79-113.
- Weber, M. (1947), *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, Henderson, A. and Paesons, T., trs., London & New York.
- Whidden, C. (2007), 'The Account of Persia and Cyrus' Persian Education in Xenophon's "Cyropaedia"', *The Review of Politics* 69, 539-567.
- Whitby, M. (2004), 'Xenophon's Ten Thousand as a Fighting Force', in Lane Fox, R. ed., *The Long March, Xenophon and the Ten Thousand*, New Haven & London, 215-242.
- Whitehead, D. (1990), *Aineias the Tactician, How to Survive under Siege*, Oxford.
- Whitfield, B. (1956), 'Virgil and the Bees: A Study in Ancient Apicultural Lore', *Greece & Rome* 3, 99-117.
- Wiemer, H. (2005), 'Die gute Ehefrau im Wandel der Zeiten: von Xenophon zu Plutarch',

Hermes 133, 424-446.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1881), *Antigonos von Karystos*, Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. (1893), *Aristoteles und Athens*, Berlin.

Willner, D. (1982), 'The Oedipus Complex, Antigone, and Electra: The Woman as Hero and Victim', *American Anthropologist* 84, 58-78.